

# THE CHRISTIAN REFORMER.

No. LXXIV.]

FEBRUARY, 1851.

[VOL. VII.]

DR. ANDREW COMBE.\*

THE name of Dr. Andrew Combe must be well known to most of our readers. His various medical works, which were written for popular use and are admirably adapted to their purposes, have secured for him a large amount of respect and gratitude. He is to be numbered among the men who are hailed by the public voice as benefactors of their species; and the interest inspired by his well-directed efforts for human good, naturally begets a desire to be acquainted with his personal history. This desire is gratified in the biographical record concerning him which has been drawn up by his equally well-known brother, Mr. George Combe.

It was easy to anticipate what sort of a volume would, under these circumstances, be produced. We might be sure that it would be carefully and honestly composed, so that its representation of facts could be fully depended upon. We might be equally sure that it would neglect no opportunity of setting forth the claims and triumphs of Phrenology. We should be unreasonable in looking to it either for depth of feeling or loftiness of thought; but might confidently reckon upon its invariably exhibiting a strong and enlightened perception of whatever contributes to the good or evil of the present life. All these expectations are fully realized; and we are thus furnished with a book which is sometimes very characteristic and always instructive.

In the Preface to the Life, there is a testimony to Dr. Combe's character and the value of his biography, in which we concur, as singularly pertinent to the case.

"A physician in extensive practice in England, expressed himself to the following effect:—'Dr. Combe's chief characteristics were sagacity, integrity, kindness, prudence, and intellectual activity; but he was not distinguished as an original thinker, and made no discoveries in science or medicine. The leading interest of his Life, therefore, in England, will consist in its exhibiting the history of a peculiar mind placed in peculiar circumstances; I mean a mind eminently Scotch, formed under a Scotch education.'"<sup>†</sup>

Eminently Scotch he indeed was. The very portrait prefixed to this book might be taken for an ideal representation of a Scotchman. The mouth seems just framing to utter the brogue. Here is a scene

\* The Life and Correspondence of Andrew Combe, M.D., Fellow of the Royal College of Physicians of Edinburgh; one of the Physicians in Ordinary, in Scotland, to the Queen; and Corresponding Member of the Imperial and Royal Society of Physicians in Vienna. By George Combe. 8vo. Pp. 563. Longman and Co. 1850.

† Preface, p. v.

which we could suppose was transferred from some novel, where it appeared as a caricature of the behaviour of a Scotch boy.

"The 9th day of April 1812 was fixed for his entry to Mr. Johnston's establishment, and he was desired to dress himself for the occasion. His father was prepared to accompany him and introduce him. Andrew was sullen, did nothing, and said nothing. His brother George, who was nine years older than himself, and had reached to manhood, still lived in his father's house. He saw with regret this unpleasant state of affairs, and took an earnest and active part in endeavouring to induce Andrew to enter on his profession. His father assured Andrew that if he would name any other vocation which he preferred, he should not be asked to move one step in the intended career; but no answer was returned. George solicited and obtained his father's solemn promise, which was never known to be broken, that if Andrew would make trial of Mr. Johnston's establishment for one day, he should not be desired to return if he disliked it. Still no answer was given. As an appointment for ten o'clock had been made with Mr. Johnston, and his time was valuable, it became necessary either to resort to compulsion, or to abandon the arrangement altogether. It was, however, against all rule in the family to permit evasion of what was regarded as a duty, merely because the thing to be done was disagreeable; and as the kindest assurances had been given, and no reason assigned for opposition, force was at last resorted to. An attempt was made to substitute Andrew's best coat and vest for the house-garments in which he was dressed, and he resisted; but his resistance was overcome. A new consultation was now held as to what was to be done; and again it was resolved that Andrew should not be allowed to conquer, seeing that he still assigned no reason for his resistance. He was, therefore, lifted from the ground; he refused to stand; but his father supported one shoulder, George carried the other, and his younger brother James pushed him on behind; and in this fashion he was carried from the house, through the brewery, and several hundred yards along the high road, before he placed a foot on the ground. His elder brother John, observing what was passing, anxiously inquired, 'What's the matter?' James replied, 'We are taking Andrew to the Doctor.' 'To the Doctor!—what's the matter with him—is he ill?' James, 'Oh not at all,—we are taking him to *make* him a doctor.' At last Andrew's sense of shame prevailed, and he walked quietly. His father and George accompanied him to Mr. Johnston's house. Andrew was introduced and received, and his father left him. George inquired what had passed in Mr. Johnston's presence. 'Nothing particular,' replied his father; 'only my conscience smote me when Mr. Johnston 'hoped that Andrew had come quite willingly!' I replied, that I had given him a solemn promise that if he did not like the profession after a trial, he should be at liberty to leave it.' 'Quite right,' said Mr. Johnston; and Andrew was conducted to the laboratory."\*

Well might Dr. Combe afterwards affirm of himself, in allusion to this very scene, "I was a *dour* boy when not taken in the right way."† And yet there was another side to this picture.

"I had," says he, 'an early and great veneration for moral excellence, and after having been cold or sullen in the days of my earliest youth, I have gone to bed and cried for want of moral sympathy, and formed strong resolutions to be for ever after kind and good, no matter how others might treat me. I reproached myself also for my shortcomings in obligingness and active kindness, and felt that if met with affection and confiding regard, I could make any effort or sacrifice in return, and rejoice in the happiness of doing so. But, as you know, the affections and amenities of life were not cherished among

\* P. 17.

† P. 20.



us individually, nearly so much as stern integrity and the omnipotent sense of duty. This was from the very best intentions on the part of our excellent parents, and arose much from the oppressive spirit of their Calvinistic principles, and their own want of an enlightened education. It was, however, a great evil, and upon me it operated in producing a distrust of myself, from an idea of my unworthiness, which led me to rate myself below every other person, and, by increasing my natural shyness, cramped the free expansion of both feeling and intellect at a time when they were craving for gratification.\*

As he grew up, the better part of his nature conquered, and the "dour boy" became a self-reliant man. Though there was a natural reticence which always hung about him, the occasional manifestations of affection presented to us have an appearance of greater sincerity on that account. Can anything be more beautiful than this description of his first visit to his paternal home after the death of his mother? His father had died some time before, and when his mother's death occurred he was in Paris studying for his profession.

"I arrived, then, without being drowned, and stood on deck admiring the banks and braes of Caledonia. I trotted up from Leith in anxious expectation; but when I came to the point where the road divides, and where one street leads to my brother's, and one to my mother's, I felt pain take the place of anxiety. Often in Paris I had thought and dreamed of that point; and fancied to which I should first turn. I always coloured vividly the meeting with my mother, and figured to myself her smile of satisfaction and happiness. At that point I felt that the tie connecting me to her was torn asunder for ever, and much of the pleasure of my return taken away. Before reaching my brother's I got more collected. I found my sister alone, and tapped at the window. She let me in, but my heart was full. I could not speak. The first sight of her brought my mother, and her worth and loss, to my keenest recollection. I sat down, but for twenty minutes could not master my feelings enough to speak. My sister was much affected. After some time the emotion subsided. I found all well and thriving. I went up to the brewery and found my other sister alone, and my mother's chair empty, where I had left her, with such a different expectation. Never till my actual arrival could I, in common thinking, believe that she was gone for ever. Often till then was I in imagination telling her what I had been doing, and watching the kind expression of her face. Her portrait, too, was there: but excuse me, Collie—I have said more than enough."†

It is not our intention to go over the incidents of Dr. Combe's life. To do so would be to present little more than a dry catalogue of names and dates. Some few particulars, however, must be mentioned. He was born in Edinburgh, October 27, 1797, being one of seventeen children. His father was a brewer, in apparently good circumstances; and the domestic administration of his home was conducted with true Presbyterian straitness. From the beginning, he came under the influence of his brother George, who was older than himself, and to whom the formation of his character was chiefly owing. An intimacy with Dr. Spurzheim fixed both brothers in the rank of his disciples, and caused them to take from Phrenology the tone and colouring of all their subsequent efforts. So early as the twenty-third year of his age, the subject of our immediate notice was attacked by consumption; and from that time to the period of his death he was, with but little intermission, engaged in a struggle with this disease. Nothing, throughout

\* P. 33.

† P. 90.

his biography, is more striking than the manner in which this mortal strife was on his part maintained. The utmost conceivable patience and carefulness and skill were employed by him, every expedient was tried, and every exposure avoided, in order to ward off or repel the attacks of the enemy. A strong determination to retain life as long as possible, united with the most unruffled calmness in the prospect of death, caused him to watch and provide against each symptom of evil with a completeness and effect altogether peculiar. There was in this case a curious combination of the personal indifference of the physician, with the personal interest of the patient; and it was as advantageous as it was curious. The preservation of life was followed as the great religious duty of life; and the result was eminently successful, for Dr. Combe lived till the 9th of August, 1847, when he was nearly fifty years old. There is somewhat too much made of the moral value of the prudent course which was thus pursued; but it affords a perfect, and indeed a pleasing, exhibition of that kind of discipline which is enforced in the *Constitution of Man*. For a few years Dr. Combe practised as a physician in Edinburgh, with much reputation; but he distinguished himself more by his writings than by his practice. He spent a large part of his time on the continent, and toward the end of life visited America. He received the appointment of Physician to the King of the Belgians in 1836, but was very soon obliged to resign that situation, on account of the unsuitability to him of the climate of Belgium. In 1838, he was made Physician extraordinary to the Queen, in Scotland, which was, however, a purely honorary office. He seems to have been on terms of great intimacy with Sir James Clark, M.D., and not long before his death a friendship was formed between him and Mr. Cobden.

That portion of Dr. Combe's correspondence which relates to his medical practice is particularly interesting. He must have been an admirable physician; and we have no doubt but that his brother's account of him in that capacity answers to the truth.

"At the time when Dr. Combe entered the medical profession, it was common for practising physicians simply to prescribe medicines, and to lay down dietetic rules to be observed by their patients, without explaining to them the nature of their maladies, or the *rationale* of the cure. Blind faith and implicit obedience were required of them. He early adopted the practice of addressing the reason and enlisting the moral sympathies of his patients, in every case in which this appeared to him practicable. He preferred the intelligent co-operation of a patient in the measures necessary for the restoration of his health, to mere observance of rules; and therefore communicated as much of the nature of the disease as could be stated without exciting injurious alarm,—explained, as far as the individual could comprehend it, the process which Nature followed in order to reach the condition of health,—and urged on him the necessity and advantage of complying with her demands. He also stated to the patient, or his attendants, the occurrences which he knew would take place in the progress of the malady before his next visit, and instructed them how to act in the emergencies as they occurred. In his communications, he practised discretion, but avoided mystery; and stated truth, as far as it could be revealed without direct injury to his patient. The consequences of this mode of proceeding were equally beneficial to his patients and to himself. They became convinced that it was Nature that was dealing with them, and that although they might 'cheat the doctor,' they could not arrest the progress of her evolutions, or escape from aggravated evils if they obstructed the



course of her sanative action. Under these convictions they obeyed his injunctions with earnestness and attention. By being premonished of approaching symptoms, which were frequently steps in the progress of the cure, but which, if not explained, might have been regarded as aggravations of the malady, they were saved from much alarm, and he from many unnecessary calls and attendances. His present biographer had ample opportunities of remarking how few messages, even during the busiest seasons of his practice, came to him from patients under treatment, and how very rarely he was called upon to visit them during the night. He ascribed this comparative immunity from nocturnal calls to the explanations and pre-arrangements now adverted to."\*

Dr. Combe's principal published works were the three following: *The Principles of Physiology applied to the Preservation of Health: The Physiology of Digestion:* and *A Treatise on the Physiological and Moral Management of Infancy*. His habits of composition are thus detailed:

"At no time was Dr. Combe a fluent writer, when method and precision were called for. He laboriously arranged his thoughts in the order best suited for their clear enunciation; and in embodying them in language, his sole aim was to express his meaning with plainness, precision, and as small an expenditure of words as was compatible with making a strong enough impression upon readers of slow apprehension. For the latter purpose, he, in his popular writings, resorted largely and most usefully to repetition of the same idea in different language, and in connection with different illustrations. In composing, he deleted and interlined abundantly, and often re-wrote his sentences."†

To this description may be properly added his own estimate of the motives which prompted him to write.

"I should like to be remembered by my friends, and associated in their minds with pleasing recollections; but for more than this I have no desire. I think I can say I never wrote a line from a hope of fame or emolument. Not that I was indifferent either to public opinion or to the value of money; for I wished that those who knew me at all should think well of me, and I was very well pleased if reward followed my labours. I can as honestly say, that though pleased and gratified, I never felt elated even by the warmest eulogiums on my writings. At first, I was doubtful whether I possessed the talent of clear exposition. The public satisfied me on that score; but I never varied in my estimate of the utility of the ideas I sought to communicate."‡

Dr. Combe was brought up in the principles of Calvinism, and subjected to that severe religious discipline which the Church of Scotland has connected with those principles. A specimen of the treatment he underwent in this respect is thus given:

"To complete the picture of domestic life at Livingston's Yards, it remains only to mention the Sunday's occupations and discipline. The gate of the brewery was locked, and all, except the most necessary work, was suspended. The children rose at eight, breakfasted at nine, and were taken to the West Church at eleven. The forenoon's service lasted till one. There was a lunch between one and two. The afternoon's service lasted from two till four. They then dined, and after dinner portions of Psalms and of the Shorter Catechism with the 'Proofs' were prescribed to be learned by heart. After these had been repeated, tea was served. Next the children sat round a table and read the Bible aloud, each a verse in turn, till a chapter for every reader had been completed. After this, sermons or other pious works were read till nine o'clock, when supper was served, after which all retired to rest. Jaded and exhausted

\* P. 140.

† P. 130.

‡ P. 399.

in brain and body as the children were by the performance of heavy tasks at school during six days in the week, these Sundays shone no days of rest to them.”\*

There are other pictures as distinct as this, relating to the religious history of the subject of this Memoir in the first part of his life; but the subsequent course of that history can only be very faintly traced. That he abandoned Calvinistic theology is quite clear; but it does not appear that he adopted any form of Christian belief in its stead. We much regret that the real state of the case on this point is not made known to us; for we are often at a loss to understand the bearing of Dr. Combe's references to religion, from our ignorance of the exact religious position which he himself sustained. If, as we suspect, he was attached to no form of Christian faith, there are grave considerations which required that a plain statement to that effect should be made. His correspondence frequently touches upon the administration of Christianity, and it is but natural to inquire what his views were of the true nature of that with whose regulation he thus concerned himself. Religion, as affecting his own feelings and conduct, he does not shrink from introducing; but it is always natural religion only, that is thus brought forward. The religion he cultivated seems, indeed, to have been natural in a more exclusive sense than that in which this term is commonly applied to religion. It consisted, according to his own description of it, mainly, if not entirely, in an obedience to natural law. It should, however, be known that this obedience was connected on his part with a devout reference to God as the author of nature, recognizing the lawgiver as well as acknowledging the law. Of the truths and motives peculiar to Christianity he takes no notice as exerting any influence upon his character. Whether assented to or not, they had evidently but little connection with his habitual thought; and to our mind the silence preserved on this subject is quite irreconcilable with a Christian faith worthy of the name. If, in forming a judgment upon this point, we have done any injustice to Dr. Combe, the blame lies with his brother, whose omissions in this case are the more to be lamented, inasmuch as they disappoint expectations raised by himself. As Dr. Combe approached to the close of life, his religious feeling appears to have acquired strength and depth. There are two letters, on national education, written by him at this period, which advocate strongly the necessity of giving to all knowledge a religious character, in the sense of avowedly directing it to the illustration of the nature and will of God. They leave a very gratifying impression upon the mind, as far as they bear upon the character of their author; but their mere naturalism is connected with positive injustice toward those whose Christian convictions urge them on toward something more than naturalism can supply.

“If you then ask, Do I advocate the teaching of *what is called religion* in our schools? I say, *No*. I advocate strongly teaching religion, but not *sectarianism*. As I view the matter, it stands thus. The nation consists of A, B, C and D, each of whom is strongly impressed with the importance of religious instruction to the welfare of the young; but along with religious truth, A has mixed up one great error, the consequences of which are evil;



B another, C a third, and D a fourth. Each sees his neighbour's error and evil, but not his own; each is, consequently, determined to enforce instruction in his error along with the truth common to all; and each is resolute not to yield place to the others. This is a *fix*. If you step in and say, 'A's error relates only to eternity, and concerns him alone—let us, therefore, exclude *his* religion altogether,' B, C and D will instantly join hands with A, and exclaim against the exclusion, because, along with his error, it throws overboard much of the truth. As none will yield, there is practically no mode of escape from the difficulty, but to prohibit them all from teaching their peculiar creeds in schools intended for the use of all, and to induce them to teach as much of the truth upon which they are all agreed as can possibly be done."\*

Upon this statement, which we think more enlightened than one which should propose education only in its secular form, we have to remark, in the first place, that neither A, B, C nor D, would assent to the doctrine, that "the truth upon which they are all agreed" can accomplish the purposes of religion if presented alone. In the second place, what is here called "sectarianism" has quite as much claim to the treatment appropriate to religious truth, as belongs to the kind of religion which is distinguished from it. A third objection lies in the fact, that the pursuit of this plan would have the effect of giving to the religion or sectarianism of some F, a patronage and authority which A, B, C and D are bound to resist as injurious to their interests. Such remarks as these, however, though conclusive in themselves, are beneath the importance of the subject to which they refer. This compromise with regard to what is esteemed to be religious truth, not only affects the conflicting claims of individuals who all stand upon an equality of right, but it also affects the very nature and value of truth itself. If A, B, C and D possess a spirit worthy of their faith, they would, on such a proposal being submitted to them, ask with indignation, on what moral ground it is that the vote of a majority should be suffered to decide upon the truth or error or comparative utility of their respective religious opinions? and whether it is supposed that the spiritual welfare of mankind will be promoted by thus reducing the supply of religious aliment to the lowest degree of negation which the popular belief may sanction?

It may throw some light upon the religious position which Dr. Combe sustained to direct attention to certain views here recorded, on *The proper Time for publishing New Opinions*. A brief extract or two from the paper thus headed will suffice for our purpose.

"The Reformation came, and all its good and evil consequences. But it is a matter for grave consideration, whether more good would not have resulted, had the plan been pursued of diffusing truth quietly, and leaving Popery, indulgences, purgatory, &c., to tumble at their leisure, by their own downward tendency."†

"With regard to martyrdom and moral persecution, my conviction at present is, that one ought to abide by them when truth requires it, but that every thing should be done, in the way of diffusing truth, to avoid drawing them on one. When new truths are put forward on their own basis with calm earnestness, and prevailing errors are not directly assailed without a positive necessity for the assault, the public mind remains more open to the admission and diffusion of the truth, and a moral influence in their favour is gained by prudent forbearance towards prevailing error; so that when the public mind

becomes prepared for the subversion of the latter, the effete opinions will be quietly replaced by the living truths."\*

"The evils of knocking down without supplying the place of established and influential errors, seem to me so great, that if it were in my power at one blow to sweep away all errors in religion, leaving the human mind, *quoad ultra*, to its existing resources, I would not do it. Changes in the belief and practical application of principles are so very slow, that God seems to have purposely rendered us tenacious even of error, to prevent our being cast loose without compass or guide of any kind. The more we cling to error, in ignorance that it is so, the more shall we cling lovingly to truth when we come to see it in all its manliness, purity, and beauty."†

These sentiments are more dangerous on account of the abuses to which they are so easily liable, than they are on account of the positive errors they contain; and yet they contain no small degree of error. That there is "a time to keep silence, and a time to speak," we freely allow. The principle, however, on which these times should be discriminated is not, as we are here taught, that of separating between one application of the truth and another, but it is that of choosing the most fitting opportunity for the manifestation of truth in all its applications. The right principle lays a man under a universal obligation as to the truth, but requires him to discharge that obligation in consistency with his circumstances. The wrong principle treats certain bearings of the truth itself as matters of circumstantial obligation only. Under the influence of the former, a man will never balance the interests of truth against any temporal interests that may belong to him; but under the influence of the latter, he will suffer mere secular advantages to decide what kind of truth he should uphold or advocate. We fully assent to the doctrine that pulling down error ought to be accompanied with a conscientious endeavour to build up truth in its place; and we gratefully acknowledge that it is part of the plan of Divine Providence to bring good out of the evil he permits. The Infinite Being who manages human affairs has, however, called for our co-operation in the form of invariable moral duty, not in the form of an imitation of the acts of his incommunicable sovereignty. Between the discharge of that duty when "new truths are to be put forward on their own basis," and its discharge when "errors are to be directly assailed," no moral distinction can be drawn. We are responsible for the one application of that duty just as we are for the other. Our service to truth cannot be fulfilled unless the responsibility be in each case answered. To choose the case of promulgation and to neglect that of assault, would be as abortive in effect as it would be wrong in principle. The errors opposed to the truth we have to administer present the most favourable occasions for the practical exemplification of the power of that truth. Kept apart from them, truth will sink into a useless abstraction. The field for its fight is the field of its triumph; and the means for its exercise are the means of its growth. If not employed, in accordance with its natural use, it will wither and die in our hearts; and if the time should come when the "public mind," thus falsely dealt with, shall be "prepared for the subversion of error," "the effete opinions" may indeed "quietly" perish, but the moral life which ought to "replace" them will be sighed for in vain. Were there

\* P. 420.

† Ibid.



no other objection to the passages we have last quoted, their want of spiritual elevation, and the cold, calculating temper in which they are conceived, would be sufficient to stamp them as unworthy of their theme.

We have intimated that it would be a point of prudence to provide very largely for the possible encroachment of the Phrenological element in this piece of biography; but it may be doubted whether any such provision would not be exceeded by the existing reality. We were aware that Mr. George Combe was accustomed to watch the interests of his theory of mind, with the same anxiety with which a fond mother keeps her eye upon the motions of a ricketty child. We had been made to feel that his intense consciousness on this subject turned his literary efforts into an unceasing argumentative fight. We sometimes imagined that his endeavours to recommend the favourite system partook rather of the boastful importunity of a public exhibitor, than the calm confidence of a philosopher. At a repetition of either of these modes of action we should not have been surprised. We were therefore only provoked to a good-humoured smile when, on turning to the end of this book, as we first took it in hand, we beheld the eternal plate of the four sections of "*The Phrenological Bust*," and found ready to our service a "*Brief Outline of the Phrenological Faculties, with their Uses and Abuses*." Alas! we knew not, even then, what lay before us. As early, however, as the second page of the Life itself, we met with the sentence—"the lowland Scotch have long been celebrated for a *perfervidum ingenium*, or, in phrenological language, for vigorous propensities of Combativeness and Destructiveness." At this point we began to suspect the melancholy truth, that an attempt would be made to construct the whole narrative in consistency with the jargon of the sect to which its author belonged. Such indeed is the case, and the result is sometimes as mirthful as it is melancholy. It is thus, for instance, that Mr. George Combe describes his father:

"Bilious and nervous in temperament, and endowed with a large brain, he was of an active and energetic character. . . . The organs of his propensities, except Combativeness, were inferior in size to those of the moral sentiments and intellect. His intellectual organs were well developed, but the reflecting region predominated. . . . His chief characteristics were Conscientiousness and Benevolence, combined with a constitutional temperance, which never forsook him."\*

His mother is represented after a similar fashion:

"She was of middle stature, of a nervous and bilious temperament, and full of life and energy. Her head was of an average size, but very favourably proportioned. The perceptive organs predominated slightly over the reflective organs, giving her an eminently practical character: Benevolence, Cautiousness, Conscientiousness and Firmness, were largely developed, and in these qualities there was an entire harmony between her and her husband."†

The same mode of representation is adopted with regard to his brother:

"In Andrew these qualities were combined with a brain of full average size, in which the anterior lobe was large, but the organs of Individuality and Eventuality were *minus*, while those of Comparison, Causality, and Wit, were

\* P. 5.

† P. 7.

*plus*;—the organs of the moral sentiments were all largely developed, Veneration and Benevolence slightly preponderating; while the organs of the animal propensities were rather under than above an average in size in relation to the moral and intellectual. The result was a constant activity of the faculties generally, a natural refinement, and a predominant love of the pure, the useful, the beneficent, the beautiful, and the intellectual.”\*

Now, setting aside the questions of good taste and practical utility which are involved in this method of writing, we have a serious objection to it on the ground of its manifest inaccuracy. It was Mr. Combe's object in the sentences we have quoted to convey certain facts relative to the several dispositions of his father, mother and brother. There were three ways of so doing open to him, according to his own notions on the subject. He might have given the phrenological development in each case, and inferred the character from it. He might have given his impression of their characters as derived from observing the actions of the parties. He might also have compared the phrenological development with the observation of conduct, and given the result of the two. Either of these methods would have been fair; but the one he adopted instead of them is unfair. He has connected together phrenological statements and observations of life, as though the two things were by universal concession of the same nature, and bore the same relation to the subject. This, we say, is not fair.

Let us, in order to test its fairness, take the first sentence we have quoted from the account of the father. “Bilious and nervous in temperament, and endowed with a large brain, he was of an active and energetic character.” That he was of an active and energetic character is a point of general observation; that his large brain gave him this character, is a point of phrenological doctrine. The doctrine and the observation are not identical, but they are here assumed to be so. We may assent to the truth of the latter without acknowledging the validity of the former; and we reasonably require that the two things should be kept separate, so that we may clearly understand what is fact and what is theory, and prevent the one being passed upon us for the other. “His chief characteristics,” we are further told, “were Conscientiousness and Benevolence, combined with a constitutional temperance which never forsook him.” Conscientiousness and Benevolence are phrenological organs, but temperance is not so, and the term is here used to express a habit of life. In the face of this plain diversity of subject, Mr. Combe has no right to use these various terms as though they expressed facts of character which rested upon the same kind of evidence. “The result,” he says, in the case of the brother,—“the result was a constant activity of the faculties generally, a natural refinement, and a predominant love of the pure, the useful, the beneficent, the beautiful, and the intellectual.” The result of what? Why, as it is here, of a certain conformation of the head. To this we reply, It may be so, but that result, as actually stated, is a summary of observations upon the life, and plain justice demands that it should have been presented in a form which connected it with such observations, and not be thus set forth as a matter of philosophical deduction.

This employment of phrenological language, therefore, confounds



together two distinct classes of ideas with which it professedly deals; and the confusion produced, if not intended to secure an unfair advantage, has the same effect as a disingenuous artifice would have.

In Dr. Combe's correspondence may be found some notable specimens of the inaccuracy we are pointing out. We do not attach the same importance to them as we do to the deliberate transgressions of his biographer; but they serve to show in what way a phrenological belief influences the mental habit of its subjects, even more plainly than the less familiar illustrations to which we have hitherto referred. For example:

"My Self-Esteem, Love of Approbation, and Cautiousness, are my troublesome organs, which I should like to have diminished a little. . . . My Destructiveness, too, is sometimes troublesome."\*

"If Combateness has advanced opposition, tell it so; and do not allow the organ of Language to supply it with a single word till the fit is off. If Self-Esteem or Acquisitiveness ask anything inconsiderately, set Conscientiousness and Benevolence to judge between you and others by exchanging places."†

"At our departure, he was in waiting at the coach office to see the last of me. His countenance was radiant with Benevolence and Adhesiveness, and his advice was earnest and from the heart."‡

It is almost superfluous to observe, that this language does not answer to the existing reality, but was adopted in accommodation to a preconceived hypothesis. The organs specified in the first quotation were not troublesome, for the Dr. must have been unconscious of their operation. His trouble arose from the feelings of which these organs were the supposed signs or instruments. It was impossible for the lady to whom our second quotation was addressed to do anything to or with the organs she is told to regulate. Her efforts at self-correction could only have related to a discipline that was purely mental. Our third quotation is still wider from the mark. An expression corresponding to the friendship in his heart was no doubt reflected from Dr. Spurzheim's face on the occasion alluded to; but Benevolence and Adhesiveness as phrenological organs did not appear upon the countenance at all, but preserved their normal quietude under the concealment of his hat.

We have dwelt the longer upon the improper use of phrenological terms which forms one of the distinctive features of this book, because the fault it illustrates is inherent in the system. A similar impropriety is traceable throughout every statement of phrenology with which we are acquainted. The whole philosophy is vitiated by the assumption that a coincidence between certain human actions and certain forms of the human head, is demonstrative of an organization of which no direct evidence is even pretended to exist. The coincidence may be perfectly correct; but until the organization itself can be exhibited in the structure of the brain itself, it is by a mere jump to a conclusion that the detail of facts can be conveyed by expressions conformed to the theory of organs.

We would be understood as not by any means objecting to the prominence given to phrenology itself in this Memoir. Such prominence is but in keeping with the subject. Besides that his other merits confer a weight of authority upon his opinion in this case, Dr. Combe is, in

\* P. 83.

† P. 158.

‡ P. 207.

our judgment, the most enlightened and reasonable advocate the system has yet met with. Nevertheless, were the question concerning the truth of that system placed before us, in this volume, only as a matter of philosophical belief, we should pass it by, as not within the scope of the present article. That question, however, comes under our notice here in certain practical forms which we cannot refuse to consider. Dr. Combe frequently acknowledges, in terms indicative of great sincerity and earnestness, the obligations under which he lay to phrenology, both as relating to his religious convictions and his medical practice. We will give a specimen of what he affirms on each of these topics.

Thus we are told as to religion :

“In regard to the influence of Phrenology on my religious views, I think it right to add, that I never knew what peace of mind on religious subjects was, till I arrived, by slow degrees, at my present views—most of them more than twenty years ago; and that, such as they are, they have stood the test of my illnesses in 1820-1-2, and 1831-2-3, and continue to this hour to satisfy my judgment and support my faith in unhesitating reliance upon the goodness of the Being who created me. In this reliance, I am wholly uninfluenced by any real or supposed merits of my own; for I know my weakness on that score.”\* “Phrenology was a great blessing to me in finally clearing up and giving consistency to my views, and consequently in giving me an abiding peace of mind. By explaining the source of my own feelings, and of certain prevailing dogmas, in the workings of the primitive faculties of the mind, often unregulated by knowledge or reason,—and elucidating the relations of man to his Creator and to the external world,—it effectually removed my difficulties, and threw a clear and sustaining light upon obscurities which had previously bewildered me. It thus gave me that firm and improving trust in God, which has been to me the source of much happiness, and I hope of some improvement, and has since been *the* abiding feeling of my mind.”†

The medical advantages derived from this subject are stated as follows :

“I may mention that part of the advantages conferred upon me in my professional capacity by Phrenology, consisted, first, in the much clearer light which it threw upon the origin and nature of nervous and mental diseases, and, secondly, in the power which it gave me of discriminating the dispositions and tendencies of individual patients, and appreciating the influence of these qualities on the progress of their diseases, and in their conduct towards myself and those about them, and also in the facilities which it afforded me in regulating and turning these dispositions to account for their behoof. This knowledge not only enabled me to bear without disturbance the many little rubs and disagreeables which the irritability of disease calls forth from some characters on all around them, and which, rightly viewed, are as harmless as, viewed in a wrong light, they are harassing and vexatious; but also enabled me to gain the confidence of my patients, and soothe and sympathise with them in a way which gave them great comfort, and promoted their recovery, without calling for any mere flattery or sacrifice of truth in what I said to them. It enabled me, in short, to address myself to *the individual* in a way which ‘the individual’ felt to apply to him as a separate being endowed with qualities of his own; instead of merely addressing to each words of comfort and good-nature equally applicable to every one, and which, therefore, no one feels as appropriate to his own peculiar use.”‡

“Those who are not familiar with the manner in which Phrenology mixes itself up with a man’s whole thoughts and feelings, when he has once gained

\* P. 406.

† P. 407.

‡ P. 409.



a thorough knowledge of it and is convinced of its truth, will be unable to conceive the extent to which it really availed me in this way, and will fancy that I ascribe to it what resulted entirely from natural tact; but I, who know from consciousness what passed within me, and am aware that without its aid, to shew me clearly my own position relatively to my patients, and how to act advantageously upon each, am a better judge in this question than they are. I was in a position similar to that of a thorough chemist, who, trained to philosophic thinking, lays useful results before the 'practical' man, so clearly and simply, that the latter is apt to imagine them destitute of depth, and the mere inspiration of 'common sense.'\*"

"The aid which Phrenology affords in discriminating the true nature of nervous and mental diseases, and in enabling the physician and attendants to regulate their physical and especially their moral treatment, on clear, consistent, and intelligible principles, is very great—much greater, indeed, than an uninformed though sensible on-looker could imagine or believe. The advantage which a phrenological physician has in his own intercourse with a nervous patient consists, not merely in the clearer view which he obtains of the nature of the disease, but in the facilities which he possesses for working upon the sound faculties of the mind, and removing all objects calculated to rouse those which are morbidly susceptible. Knowing the functions of the primitive powers of the mind, he is aware what objects are specially related to each, what ought to be avoided, and what cherished. He can enter into conversation with the patient intelligently, and make him feel that *he really knows* his true state. This is the first step to confidence in nervous disease; and confidence, as Esquirol long ago remarked, is the first step to the cure of the insane. I have often been told most feelingly by nervous, and sometimes by insane patients, that I understood them better than any one they had come into contact with."†

We shall dismiss the religious part of this case with the simple observation, that a belief in phrenology is not at all necessary to the views it expresses. That phrenology was the means of bringing those views home to Dr. Combe's mind, may be true; but the considerations relating to the character of God and the nature of man which they embrace, are dependant, not upon any theory concerning the mode of mental expression, but upon facts bearing upon the constitution and operation of the mind itself, which are suggested by human experience and conduct. Phrenology itself must rest upon such facts, if it is to be established at all; and a surer and broader foundation for religious belief is presented by them in their natural form, than when they are transmitted to us as adapted to the necessities of an intermediate scheme devised for a different purpose. It is not what is peculiar to phrenology that does or can involve the religious conclusions on which Dr. Combe rested. If those conclusions be true, they are so by virtue of the common circumstances of life, which supply to phrenology that condition of its problem about which there is no dispute.

The statement of medical obligation we have given, demands a stricter notice. It is observable that Dr. Combe does not assert that the physical organization predicated by phrenology afforded him any facilities in his medical practice. He was clearly not able to avail himself of that, as anatomically distinguished, and he did not attempt to follow out its developments with a correspondent treatment, as would have been done with a case of muscular or nervous or any other organization,

\* P. 411.

† P. 412.

positively ascertained. It is in quite another line that success was sought for. That line was the adaptation of the physician's behaviour and advice to the mental peculiarities attaching to his patient. Phrenology, we are told, was especially serviceable in supplying rules for such an adaptation. We can fully believe that it was, without giving our consent to the phrenological system. The merit of the case lies in bringing *any* mental system honestly and wisely to bear upon the fulfilment of a physician's duty toward his patient. Let this be attempted, and whatever be the theory of intellect and morals, beneficial results, similar to those here described, will be produced, in proportion to the common sense, and power of observation, and practical skill of the person making the attempt. Dr. Combe's share of each of these qualities we rate very highly; but we do not attribute any more to his "natural tact" than he himself does, when we estimate his success according to them. They were the means which enabled him to apply the phrenological scheme, in the instances with which he had to do, so as to secure success; and they would have accomplished the same end, with at least a scarcely appreciable difference, had the scheme by which they professedly worked been even less tenable than that of phrenology. It is quite astonishing what an amount of theoretical difficulty will, in such a case, be overcome by the prudent management of a clear-headed man, and how such management may even turn the absurdities of a theory into an occasion of actual advantage. Phrenology includes a distinctive classification of mental phenomena. We believe the classification to be very incorrect as a whole, but it nevertheless answers to reality in some important particulars; and, what is more to our purpose, each of its so-called faculties implies a generalized result. The machinery thus provided is, by its very nature, fitted for practical use; and, rude as it may be in itself, it will work in obedience to the dexterity of the hand which employs it. The extremely flexible character of the phrenological definitions, though affording a strong objection to their philosophical truth, is a recommendation to them as instruments auxiliary to our judgment of mankind, in so far as it leaves the judgment more open to the influence of an independent rational investigation.

As we have now a favourable opportunity for so doing, we will here, without professing formally to discuss the subject, record our own estimate of the value of phrenology. It is not an estimate in any respect hastily formed; for in days gone by, we paid quite as much attention to the subject as our conscience would justify.

We are persuaded, then, that there is not only a great deal of truth mixed up with this system, but that a considerable share of truth attaches to its peculiarities. The latter truth, however, is of a kind so loose and undeterminate in its very nature, as to render its reduction to a scientific form altogether impossible. We therefore reject the pretensions of phrenology to anything of the nature of a science. Phrenology occupies with us much the same position as physiognomy does. There is truth in physiognomy to such an extent that none of us can help making observations and forming opinions, on the faith of it; but an attempt at the scientific expression of this truth is worse than useless, for it is calculated to substitute a mere prejudice for an effort of natural sagacity.



That the mental capacity of a man is, in very general terms and with a very doubtful application, indicated by the form of his head, we think to be more than probable. This we are not only willing to concede, but we have no objection to elevate the concession into a principle of practical use. We do not, however, assent to the phrenological doctrine that the brain is the organ of the mind. Nothing more bearing upon that doctrine has been proved to us, than that the brain is the source of nervous action. That is all we can accept and all we need. As the nervous system is that by which the communication of the mind with the external world is fulfilled, mental faculty and nervous energy must have an intimate connection and correspondence with each other. The great fountain and reservoir of that energy will therefore naturally possess a characteristic analogy to the mind, with whose operations it has so much to do. Such analogy is matter not only of legitimate, but of necessary observation on our part; and thus it may come to pass that phrenology, while expressive of no small amount of truth, will be unable to support the philosophical pretensions it puts forth. The truth is dependant upon a coincidence or identical occurrence of circumstances which the philosophy represents as cause and effect. It is not, therefore, capable of bearing the weight of a theory constructed according to such philosophy.

This state of the case will account for the strange difference observable between the result of phrenology as it is administered by a wise man or a fool. Supplying very little positive direction to either, because of the unscientific vagueness which really belongs to the subject, it is as subservient to the purposes of folly as to those of wisdom; and so far from correcting the natural deficiencies of its professors, as a real science must in some measure do, it has the unfortunate effect of persuading the fool to a more ridiculous exhibition of his folly than would otherwise be possible to him.

The unscientific character of phrenology is capable of so plain and full a demonstration, that the question ought to be considered as finally settled.

There is no division of the brain which corresponds to the phrenological organs. They do not answer to its structure, although it possesses a structure which can be anatomically developed.

The surface of the brain and the external surface of the head do not so exactly coincide as to permit of any accurate inference as to the former, being drawn from the appearance of the latter. There is a general likeness between them, but it is not such a likeness as will justify our conclusions about minute differences of situation and elevation like those with which phrenology is concerned.

The phrenological mapping of the outside of the head is so confused and complicated, that the distinction between one organ and another cannot in many instances be preserved. What appears straightforward enough on a plaster bust, constructed purposely to include the whole apparatus, will be found a mere mockery of arrangement when applied to the living subject.

If the enumeration of faculties presented by this system be compared with the actual phenomena of mental operation, a sad discrepancy between the two will be discovered. On the supposition of their truth, the phrenological organs should comprise an outline of the philosophy

of mind ; but this is not the case, unless on the assumption that those organs are to be accepted as superseding all philosophical investigation. Nothing can be more conclusive than the analysis which classes a distinct department of mental operation under the head of Memory ; but Memory is not to be found among the phrenological organs at all. This circumstance is to be regarded as more than a specimen of fatal omission ; it is a pregnant example of the unnatural method pursued throughout the whole detail in which it occurs.

Were it even to be allowed that the phrenological organs are both physically ascertained and philosophically discriminated, they might still be shewn to be unsuitable to their professed purpose. On the same principles and for the same reasons, by virtue of which they have been selected, vast numbers of others ought to be added to the list ; and a consistent endeavour to express the powers and dispositions of man after the fashion thus proposed, would soon absorb the very form of scientific statement in the incalculable multitude of particulars into which it would branch itself.

We have not by any means exhausted our stock of objections to this pretended science ; but, without pursuing the subject any farther, we wish to fix the attention of our readers upon an important conclusion which we think to be deducible from what we have said. It has been already more than once alluded to ; but it derives especial confirmation from such facts as have just passed under our review. It is this. The particulars alleged in any given case of phrenological development admit of the utmost variety of explanation in their reference to human character.

Phrenology, if this be true, becomes a scheme of constantly recurring shifts and turns, which at once prevents all certainty of judgment, and provides for the evasion of all possible difficulties. We have never seen a phrenological estimate of character which we could not easily, and in perfect conformity with the terms it included, adapt to a different issue from the one declared. It was but to shuffle the cards afresh, and the luck of the game would be changed. This mode of attack, however, we never found to avail anything with a skilful opponent, because he could immediately draw from it his means of defence. He had only to adopt a re-arrangement of his materials, in order to protect his threatened position. Thus it happens that what ought to be a serious investigation of facts assumes the character of a mere straining of invention in favour of plausible expedients.

The point on which we are now touching is exceedingly well put in an article on Phrenology, contained in the last edition of the *Encyclopædia Britannica*.

“ A moderate share of dexterity in reconciling apparent discrepancies will suffice to ensure a preponderance of favourable evidence : since, fortunately, there have been provided in the brain different organs, sometimes of similar and sometimes of opposite properties, capable, by a little adjustment of *plus* or *minus*, on either side of the equation, of furnishing the requisite degrees of the mental quality sought for, and of thus solving every psychological problem. We shall suppose, for instance, that he is inspecting the head of a person known to have given credit to the prophecies of a weather almanack ; he finds, on reference to the ‘ system of Phrenology,’ that a belief in astrology is the offspring of No. 16, that is, *Ideality* ; so that if this organ happen to be sufficiently large, the phenomenon is at once accounted for. But if it be not, our phrenologist will have another chance ; for he will probably discover it to



arise from the dimensions of No. 15, which inspires *Hope*, the source of the *propensity to credulity*. Habitual *irresolution* may result either from the magnitude of No. 12, or the diminutiveness of No. 18; thus affording very great convenience for making our observations of the character square with those of the dimensions of the organs, and *vice versa*. If, again, the magnitude of the organ of *Combattività* accord with the manifestations of pugnacity given by the individual, it is well; and we need inquire no farther, but set it down at once as an irrefragable proof of the accuracy of phrenological determinations. Should the correspondence, however, not prove satisfactory, the organ being large, for instance, and the manifestation small, we have then further to examine the dimensions of the organ of *Caution*, the influence of which is to moderate and check the operation of the former; and we shall perhaps find this organ sufficiently large to account for the phenomenon. Both these organs may be large, or both small, or the first may be small and the second large, or the converse; and other modifications of action may result if either one or both be only of moderate size, allowing great latitude of choice in the assignment of motives. Should we be so unfortunate as to exhaust all the combinations, without meeting with the success we desire, there is still an abundance of auxiliary faculties of which we may avail ourselves with advantage. If we were to explain the fact of the individual in question having accepted a challenge, he might have been inspired by *Combattività*, whose voice was 'still for war,' or goaded on by *Destructiveness*, to fight that he might destroy; *Firmness* may have urged him to persevere by the consideration that he had previously resolved it, and *Concentrativeness*, by riveting his attention to the subject, may have screwed his courage to the sticking place; or he may have been prompted by *Imitation* to follow the example, or by *Approbation* to gain the applause of his friends. We have also to take into the account the countervailing influence of faculties which are pulling in the opposite direction and qualifying the combined powers of the former incentives: and should *Cautiousness* not be in sufficient force, we are to consider the power of *Conscientiousness*, which preaches forbearance, meekness and forgiveness; of *Veneration*, which appeals to the high authority of religion and law; of *Benevolence*, restraining the hand from inflicting pain and death; of *Approbation*, who qualifies her sanction by raising other voices condemnatory of the deed; and last, though not least, the *Love of life*, which recoils with instinctive dread from the possible catastrophe. Drawing, then, a diagram of all these component moral forces in their proper directions and suitable proportions, it will not be very difficult to obtain, by this artificial dynamico-phrenological process, the exact resultant which corresponds with the actual fact to be explained."\*

We have introduced this passage for another reason besides that of establishing the point to which it immediately relates. It will prove the *converse* of the position it takes up, as fully as it proves the truth of that position itself.

The process of verifying character here described is but a fair illustration of the manner in which the generalizations answering to the phrenological organs are formed. They are professedly drawn from observations made upon character. As certain actions are found to mark different individuals the shape of whose heads is similar, they are generalized into a principle of which that shape is thenceforth considered as expressive. But how are we, in the face of the accommodating practice which has just been mentioned, to depend upon the correctness of these generalizations? It is very plain that no dependance whatever can be placed upon them. The system which requires the accommo-

---

\* Encyclopædia Britannica, Vol. XVII. p. 472.

dation in the one case, cannot be free from an accommodation of a like kind in the other. To classify the various conduct of different individuals according to some principle common to the whole, is always a work of great difficulty and delicacy. A different combination of exactly the same elements will be productive of a different result. The utmost carefulness is therefore requisite both in stating the premises and in drawing the conclusion of the problem to be solved. In such an instance as the present, it is at least to be demanded that the definitions of principle should in their distinctness and comprehensiveness answer to the logical necessities of the subject. The phrenological definitions cannot justly claim this merit. The facility with which they may be made to testify to almost anything that may be desired is fatal to their logical correctness.

The deduction *from* character is thus shewn to be as uncertain as is the application *to* character; and the boasted superiority of phrenology as conformed to the actual events of life, is nothing better than a boast. The value, nay the reality, of such conformity must arise from a scientific analysis of existing facts, of which phrenology is altogether destitute.

F.

#### ON THE BOOK OF JUDGES.

THE Book of Judges contains the history of the Israelites after their conquest of Canaan, and while they were divided into twelve tribes, with no central government. It wants that clearness and chronological arrangement which we seldom find but in the history of a monarchy. Its history follows that of the Book of Joshua; but was not written in continuation of that book, as it is the older writing of the two. It is rather several distinct histories than one. Each belongs to only a part of the country and to three or four of the tribes, and they must be considered separately.

Chapter i. mentions the death of Joshua, and then the alliance between the tribes of Simeon and Judah. It enumerates some of the cities which the tribes on the west side of the Jordan were unable wholly to conquer.

With chapter ii. the book begins again, and this time before the death of Joshua. An angel tells the Israelites that they have disobeyed God's orders in making treaties with the Canaanites and in worshipping their idols; so God will not drive out their enemies before them. Joshua then dies, and is buried in the mountains of Ephraim. The tribes are enumerated whom the Israelites are unable to drive out (iii. 6). Then are mentioned the several neighbouring nations that oppressed parts of the country.

First the children of Israel did evil in the sight of the Lord, and therefore he allowed the king of Syria to overrun the land from north even to the south, where Othniel, Caleb's nephew, dwelt. They served the Syrians for eight years, and then the land had rest for forty years (iii. 11).

Again the children of Israel did evil in the sight of the Lord, and the Ephraimites round Jericho, together with the tribe of Reuben on the east of the Jordan, were held in servitude by the Moabites for



eighteen years. They were released by Ehud, of the tribe of Benjamin, who helped the Ephraimites, and the land had rest for eighty years.

About that time Shamgar delivered the southern tribes from the oppression of the Philistines who had overrun them.

And the children of Israel did evil in the sight of the Lord, and the Canaanites, whose king dwelt at Hazor, held the northern tribes in servitude for twenty years. The king of Hazor was defeated, and Sisera, his general, slain, while Deborah, the prophetess or poet, ruled in Israel. Then the land had rest for forty years (v. 31).

And the children of Israel did evil in the sight of the Lord, and the Midianites and Amalekites and people of the East invaded the country and oppressed it for seven years. They marched southward even as far as Gaza. The Israelites retired to the mountains. The great body of the Midianites had crossed the Jordan near Gilead, and pitched in the valley of Jezreel. Gideon of Ophrah, in Manasseh, took the field against them. He summoned help from Asher and Zebulon and Naphtali, and defeated them. The writer adds the tradition that the rocks of Oreb and Zeeb, near Ophrah, were so named after the two leaders of the Midianites then slain (vii.). Gideon drove the Midianites across the Jordan and into their own country; and then the land had rest for forty years (viii.). After his death, Abimelech, one of his sons, slew his brethren and made himself king at Shechem, the capital of Ephraim. He reigned for three years, when the men of Shechem rebelled against him; and though he at first defeated them, he was soon defeated and slain (ix.). After his death, Tola was judge over Israel in Ephraim for twenty-three years, and then Jair, of Gilead, was judge for twenty-two years (x. 5).

And the children of Israel did evil in the sight of the Lord, and served idols, and they were delivered into the hands of the Philistines and Ammonites. The Ammonites oppressed the Israelites on the east of the Jordan for eighteen years. They also crossed the Jordan to fight against Judah and Benjamin and Ephraim. Then Jephthah, of Gilead, who had been living in the land of Tob, near Damascus, delivered his countrymen, and defeated the Ammonites, and drove them beyond the mountains. Before the battle, he made a vow that he would slay, as a burnt-offering to God, whatsoever he should first meet as he returned home. He returned home a conqueror, to be ruler of Gilead and judge of Israel; and his daughter, his only child, came out to wish him joy. He allowed her two months to mourn, and then slew her according to his vow (xi.).

This success of the people of Gilead against the enemy gave them a weight among the tribes which made Ephraim jealous. They accordingly crossed the Jordan and invaded Gilead. But they were beaten by Jephthah, and he reached the ford of the Jordan before them to cut them off on their retreat. The guard at the passage asked every man to pronounce the word *Shibboleth*, and whoever said *Sibboleth* was known to be an Ephraimite and slain accordingly. Jephthah judged Israel for six years. After him, Ibzar judged for seven years. He was a native of Bethlehem, no doubt the town of that name in Zebulon. Then Elon, of Zebulon, judged Israel for ten years. Then Abdon, of Ephraim, judged Israel for eight years (xii.).

And the children of Israel did evil in the sight of the Lord, and the land was delivered into the hands of the Philistines for forty years. During this time, Samson made his heroic struggles against the Philistines of the city of Gaza, in behalf of his countrymen of Dan and Judah (xvi.).

The book ends with two pieces of history which are wholly separate from the rest.

First, in those days when there was no king in Israel, a man of Ephraim made for himself idols and consecrated one of his sons to be his priest. Afterwards he hired a levite of the family of Judah from Bethlehem to be his priest; and then he trusted that the Lord would take care of him (xvii.). About that time, the tribe of Dan, finding its lands between Benjamin and the coast too narrow for their numbers, sent a party northward to seize other lands from the Canaanites. In passing through Ephraim they took with them the before-mentioned levite as their adviser and priest; and they were successful in turning out the inhabitants, and making themselves masters of a district at the foot of Mount Lebanon (xviii.).

The second is of the war between the tribe of Benjamin and the rest of the Israelites, also in the days when there was no king in Israel. A certain levite went up from Ephraim to Judah to fetch his wife. As they returned home through Benjamin she was ill-treated by the men of that tribe, whereupon he slew her to mark his anger against them (xix.). When the Israelites next met in general assembly at Mizpeh, this levite told them of the wrong done him; and to avenge him, the people destroyed the cities of Benjamin, and put to death the whole of the tribe, men, women and children, except six hundred men who fled to Mount Rimmon (xx.). The Israelites made a vow that no one should give his daughter unto a Benjaminite to wife. But they afterwards repented, lest one tribe should be wanting to Israel. To supply the Benjaminites with wives, they attacked the town of Jabesh in Gilead, and slew every soul except four hundred young women, and then sent the Benjaminites to find two hundred more young women, by carrying off that number by force from the fair at Shiloh (xxi.).

These last two portions of the book form no part of the continuous history. The same may be said of the next book, the Book of Ruth. The history of the Judges is continued in the Book of Samuel. To determine the chronology we must have regard to the geography, and we shall see that the wars here mentioned do not always belong to the whole of the Israelites. The invasion from Syria overran the tribes on the west of the Jordan, probably at the same time that the Moabites conquered Reuben on the east of the Jordan, and the Midianites conquered Ephraim. The Canaanites of Hazor conquered only the northern tribes of Galilee. This was at a later period, probably at the same time with that invasion of the Philistines which was checked by Shamgar. But the invasion of the Ammonites and Philistines at the same time made a second general invasion. Thus, taking the history of Ephraim and Manasseh, we have,

Servitude under the Midianites . . . . .	7 years.
Rest under Gideon . . . . .	40
Abimelech reigned . . . . .	3



Tola judged.....	23
Jair judged .....	22

Making a total of .....	95 years
before the second general invasion. Then follows,	
Servitude under the Ammonites .....	18 years.
Jephthah judged.....	6
Ibzar judged .....	7
Elon judged.....	10
Abdon judged .....	8

Making a great total of .... 144 years.

For the north-western tribes we have a second Table of Chronology:

Servitude under the Syrians .....	8 years.
Rest .....	40
Servitude under Canaan.....	20
Deborah's rest.....	40

Making a total of ..... 108 years  
before the invasion of the Ammonites and others. This period was 95 years in the former Table.

For Reuben we have a third Table of Chronology:

Servitude under the Midianites .....	18 years.
Rest .....	80

Making a total of ..... 98 years  
before the invasion of the Ammonites and others.

For Benjamin and Judah we have a less complete chronology: thus,

Servitude under the Syrians .....	8 years.
Rest under Othniel.....	40
Servitude under Philistines .....	—
Rest under Shamgar .....	—
Servitude under the Philistines (during which Samson judged twenty years) .....	40

Thus the whole time from Joshua's death to the end of this book may have been about 150 years, divided into two periods by the second great invasion. Our first Table contains both periods. Our second and third contain only the first period. The last Table seems to contain both periods; but it is incomplete, and must be filled up by conjecture.

It seems probable that the forty years during which the southern half of the land was overrun by the Philistines, as mentioned in chap. xiii., and during half of which Samson was fighting against them in the neighbourhood of Askelon, include also the wars between Ephraim and the Philistines mentioned in 1 Samuel, chap. iv. As no Judge is mentioned between them, Samuel probably succeeded Abdon. Saul and David followed as kings. If, therefore, we allow eighty-five years to the last three, and David died in the year B. C. 1015, then the Book of Judges ends in the year B. C. 1100, and begins with Joshua's death about B. C. 1250, and the Exodus took place about B. C. 1300.

In this way, from the Exodus to the building of the temple in the

fourth year of Solomon's reign is 289 years. If, instead of considering the periods of time in part contemporaneous, we had added them all together, we should have had about the 480 years mentioned in 1 Kings vi. 1. But the above calculation is fully confirmed by the genealogies. Moses was fourth in descent from Jacob. David was eleventh in descent. Therefore, from the death of Moses to the death of David, at thirty-five years for a generation, is 245 years, and from the Exodus to David's death 285 years, agreeably to the former result.

SAMUEL SHARPE.

---

#### LORD HOLLAND'S REMINISCENCES.\*

So many pleasurable feelings are associated in our mind with the name of Lord Holland, that we are willing to believe that our readers will share with us the interest we feel in this posthumous publication of his *Foreign Reminiscences*. In the absence of an authentic memoir of his life, we are glad to receive at an earlier period than, under all the circumstances, might have been expected, a volume traced by his own graceful pen, in which we find the record of his continental experiences, and of the result of his familiar acquaintance and confidential intercourse with some of the most distinguished persons of foreign courts. We shall place it on our shelves next to that remarkable manual of political wisdom, "*The Opinions of Lord Holland, as recorded in the Journals of the House of Lords.*"

Many circumstances combined to attract Lord Holland, especially in his youth and early manhood, to the Continent of Europe. Losing his father in infancy and his mother in his childhood, he was at a very early period left to follow his own inclinations. His orphanage was, however, in some things more than compensated to him by the guardianship and affection of his paternal uncle, Charles James Fox. If the wholesome restraints of domestic influence, and especially the salutary vigilance of maternal love, were wanting, let the circumstance be remembered in extenuation of the one fault of Lord Holland's life. As respects his political education and his public life, there was probably a balance of gain as the result of his orphanage. Mr. Macaulay has lamented that Lord Holland had not the advantage of the training, so important to the orator and statesman, of the House of Commons. No doubt, if the years which immediately followed his majority had, as in the case of his uncle and his grandfather, been passed amidst the exciting conflicts of the Lower House of Parliament, he might have acquired greater skill in elocution, and been able at once, without embarrassment or hesitation, to clothe his vigorous thoughts in appropriate language. He might have gained debating skill, but he did not need the other influences of the House of Commons to expand his feelings and views as a statesman. The personal instructions and example of his uncle, acting on his own good sense and kind heart, infused into him a love of truth and right, a sympathy with the oppressed, an anti-

---

\* *Foreign Reminiscences*, by Henry Richard Lord Holland: Edited by his Son, Henry Edward Lord Holland. Post 8vo. Pp. 362. London—Longman. 1850.



pathy to tyranny, and a contempt for corruption, which effectually protected him from the evil influences of his aristocratic position, and made him from the time he took his seat in the House of Lords in 1796, and during the whole forty-four years of his public life, the friend of the many, and the advocate of the weak, and the protector of the wronged.

During his school-boy days at Eton, his interest in politics began to manifest itself, and it was his singular felicity to enjoy then and afterwards the advantages of frequent and unreserved correspondence on political subjects with Mr. Fox. Could the series of letters that passed between these two remarkable men be made public, it would probably furnish future statesmen with a masterly outline of the elements of political science.\*

From Eton Lord Holland proceeded to Oxford in 1790, where he entered himself a student of Christchurch. He continued at the University just long enough to take his Master's degree, June 20, 1792. He immediately went abroad. There was little in England at that time to attract or gratify the pupil and nephew of Charles Fox. Mr. Pitt wielded with unsparing vigour almost despotic power, which appeared to threaten the very existence of the English constitution. The ignorance and brutality of the mob had been wrought by the remorseless agents of the Government to a pitch of frenzy, which broke out in Birmingham and other parts of the kingdom in acts of terrific anarchy. In France, the Revolution had just reached its crisis, and the hopes of those who had hailed it as the renovation of the country, began to be clouded with many dark fears. Lord Holland had visited that country for a short time in 1791. He describes himself as then "a mere boy." He was in fact eighteen years of age, and, slightly as he speaks of his qualifications at this period, he probably knew far more, both of politics and literature, than nine-tenths of our nobility at the time of manhood. He reached Paris soon after the acceptance of the constitution by Lewis XVI. He was, as might be expected, a welcome guest at the house of Lafayette. The youth whom that distinguished patriot welcomed to his society and honoured with his confidence was no "mere boy." Lord Holland found all Paris lamenting the decease of Mirabeau. That vain and not upright, but certainly highly-gifted man, had, notwithstanding some swerving from democracy, contrived to maintain his sway over the popular mind to the last.

"The solicitude of the people during his illness was unabated, and stories almost incredible of the attention of the populace, in preventing the slightest disturbance in the street where he was lying ill, were related in all societies with that delight and admiration which dramatick displays of sentiment never fail to excite in Paris. The shops and quays were crowded with his portraits and busts. A stranger could discern in his physiognomy nothing but visible

---

\* Would that, in addition, we could anticipate the publication, at some far distant day, of faithful reports of those conversations on the English constitution and history which the late Lord Melbourne is understood to have held with the Queen in the early years of her reign! To the value of those liberal and constitutional influences it will be remembered that the Duke of Wellington once bore public testimony. The subsequent experience we have, in common with all her subjects, enjoyed of her patriotic wisdom, does not diminish our sense of the importance of the lessons which Lord Melbourne gave at that critical time to his Royal pupil.

marks of debauch, vanity, presumption and artifice, which were strong ingredients in his composition; but the Parisians, yet, stunned by his eloquence, and dazzled by his splendid talents, seemed to dwell on the representation of his large features, pock-fretted face, and frizzed hair, with fond complacency mingled with regret. He was certainly an extraordinary man. That his powers would have been equal, as has often been suggested, either to check or to guide the subsequent course of the French Revolution, may nevertheless be very questionable. He was thought to be, and probably was, very corrupt; but an exemption from that vice was the solitary virtue which gave individuals, and Robespierre in particular, any ascendancy in the latter and more stormy seasons of that frightful period. Mirabeau had the talent, or at least the trick and contrivance, of appropriating the ideas and labours of other men to his purposes in a very extraordinary degree. I have been assured by one who knew him intimately, and acted for a short time as his secretary, that not only the reports he made, but the speeches he delivered, were often written by others, and read by him in the morning, or even run through and adopted by him (as I have seen briefs by our lawyers) while he was actually speaking. The various imprisonments and embarrassments to which his disorderly life and licentious pen had exposed him are well known. The prosecution against him in England was the malevolent contrivance of a crazy and faithless servant, who falsely accused his master of having robbed him. There was nothing remarkable in that incident, but the public and warm testimony of Sir Gilbert Elliot and Mr. Burke himself in favour of a man whose influence on the French Revolution was afterwards so conspicuous, and whose lax principles and immoral life furnished so fertile a theme for invectives against it. The vanity of Mirabeau exposed him, it is said, to a droll reproof. At some important political crisis, he was descanting in society on the qualities requisite in a minister to extricate the crown, the assembly, and the nation from the difficulties in which they were involved, viz., great knowledge, great genius, acquaintance and perhaps connection with the upper ranks, some common feelings with the lower classes, a power of speaking and of writing eloquently and readily, familiarity with the world, the popularity of a martyr from recent prosecution, and many others, which it was obvious enough that he thought were united in himself. 'All this is true,' said a friend, 'but you have omitted one of his qualities.' 'No—surely? what do you mean?' 'Should he not,' replied the same sarcastic friend, 'be very much pitted with the small pox?' Pp. 3—6.

Lord Holland's skill in statement has been questioned by one and not the least admiring of his friends. The various narratives, many of them highly picturesque, in the volume before us, vindicate his claim to no small narrative power. Mr. Macaulay probably intended his remark to be applied to Lord Holland's speeches, in which his deficient utterance might occasion apparent confusion in matters which did not arouse his logical dexterity or give scope for his playful wit. There is repeated proof before us of that to which all who had the privilege of his personal acquaintance bore testimony, delicate felicity of anecdote. He has the playfulness of Horace Walpole; but his wit, unlike that rather heartless personage's, is playful without bitterness. His temper was of the blindest kind. Except in the ardour of debate, when he could smite with manly vigour, especially if his opponent lay under the suspicion of meanness or cruelty, his address was courteous and urbane. In this respect he somewhat resembled his uncle, who, as Sir James Mackintosh observed, "united in a most remarkable degree the seemingly repugnant characters of the mildest of men and the most vehement of orators." In Lord Holland, the mildness was equal, but the vehe-



mence was subdued. Sir James Mackintosh, who knew intimately both Fox and his nephew, added, "The union of ardour in public sentiment with mildness in social manners, was in Mr. Fox an hereditary quality. The same fascinating power over the attachment of all who came within his sphere, is said to have belonged to his father; *and those who know the survivors of another generation, will feel that this delightful quality is not yet extinct in the race.*"

Lord Holland combined with this hereditary gentleness a strict and what men of the world were sometimes disposed to consider as a *fastidious* regard for truth. In his case the motto of his family arms was not rebuked by his life, *Et vitam impendere vero*. His "Foreign Reminiscences" abound with tokens of his desire to be verbally accurate and in all things true. The wit of an anecdote is no reason with him for passing it as sterling, if to his keen perception there are traces of exaggeration or malice. His candour to his political opponents (of personal enemies he had but few) is very striking. It is, however, always directed by a sound judgment, and does not prevent his awarding heavy censure where charity itself whispers no palliating plea.

Lord Holland was much impressed with the unaffected dignity and simplicity of Lafayette, who saw in the young English Lord who took so deep an interest in all that was passing, intelligence of mind deserving of information, and nobility of purpose entitled to confidence.

"Lafayette was, however, then as always, a pure disinterested man, full of private affection and public virtue, and not devoid of such talents as firmness of purpose, sense of honour, and earnestness of zeal will, on great occasions, supply. He was indeed accessible to flattery, somewhat too credulous, and apt to mistake the forms, or, if I may so phrase it, the pedantry of liberty for the substance, as if men could not enjoy any freedom without subscribing to certain abstract principles and arbitrary tests, or as if the profession and subscription, nay, the technical observance of such tests and principles, were not, on the other hand, often compatible with practical oppression and tyranny." P. 12.

Of Lewis XVI., Lord Holland, under the influence of Lafayette, formed a judgment in 1791 which enlarged observation and after reflection did not confirm. He was for the time persuaded that the King was sincerely attached to the new constitution.

"In this prepossession I was fortified by hearing his speech to the Legislative Assembly, which he delivered in a clear but tremulous voice, with great appearance of earnestness. Perhaps the qualified terms in which he acknowledged his original approbation and acceptance of the Constitution gave greater force to the very positive assurances which he made that he would adhere to it. He seemed in his engagements for the future to be under no constraint when he could so manifestly avow his reluctance to acquiesce in the past. 'Enfin je l'ai acceptée et je la soutiendrai et dedans et dehors,' are words which still ring on my ear, and which made no small impression at that time on my mind, not hitherto steeled, by experience of their hollowness, to royal speeches and written paragraphs. Lewis XVI. was at that very moment, if not the main instigator, a coadjutor and adviser of the party soliciting foreign powers to put down that very Constitution by force. Lewis XVI., however, was neither a bad nor a foolish man, and he certainly was not a cruel one. But sincerity is no attribute of princes educated in the expectation of power, and exposed to the dangers of civil disturbance. As Lewis did not inherit, so neither did he acquire, that virtue by discipline or reflection. He meant the good of the people whom he deemed himself destined to govern, but he thought

to promote that good more certainly by preserving than by surrendering any part of the authority which his ancestors possessed. Vanity, a weed indigenous in the soil and much favoured by an elevated state on which flattery is continually showered, conformed that notion in his mind, and disinclined him to any real confidence in his ostensible ministers and advisers. It made him fondly imagine that he never could become the tool of secret machinations or the instrument of persons in his judgment so greatly inferior in intellect and acquirements as those who surrounded him."—Pp. 13—16.

Of Marie Antoinette, the verdict of Lord Holland differs materially from that which most Englishmen, not yet recovered from the magical eloquence of Mr. Burke, would deliver. Of her want of chastity he offers presumptions and something more.

"As I was not presented at Court, I never saw the Queen but at the play-house. She was then in affliction, and her countenance was, no doubt, disfigured by long suffering and resentment. I should not, however, suppose that the habitual expression of it, even in happier seasons, had ever been very agreeable. Her beauty, however extolled, consisted, I suspect, exclusively in a fair skin, a straight person, and a stately air, which her admirers termed dignity, and her enemies pride and disdain. Her total want of judgment and temper no doubt contributed to the disasters of the Royal Family, but there was no member of it to whom the publick was uniformly so harsh and unjust, and her trial and death were among the most revolting parts of the whole catastrophe. She was indeed insensible when led to the scaffold; but the previous persecution which she underwent was base, unmanly, cruel, and ungenerous to the last degree."—Pp. 19, 20.

Notwithstanding personal neglects and slights received from him in 1791, Lord Holland is earnest in defending the memory of the Duke of Orleans from some of the many infamous imputations on his character, whose carriage and countenance he describes as prepossessing, and whose manners were perfect. The personal cowardice and base malignity against the King and Queen commonly imputed to him, Lord Holland totally disbelieved.

M. Talleyrand was an especial favourite and much-trusted authority with Lord Holland.\* We do not remember to have previously seen the anecdote of his early acquaintance with Mr. Pitt.

"He (Talleyrand) was for some time *aumonier* to his uncle, the Archbishop of Rheims; and when Mr. Pitt went to that town to learn French, after the peace of 1782, he lodged him in an apartment in the abbey of St. Thierry, where he was then residing with his uncle, and constantly accompanied him for six weeks, a circumstance to which, as I have heard M. Talleyrand remark with some asperity, Mr. Pitt never had the grace to allude either during his embassy, or his emigration, or in 1794, when he refused to recal the cruel order by which he was sent away from England, under the alien bill."—Pp. 34, 35.

Mr. Pitt had a *politician's memory*. He forgot nothing which he wished to remember, and he certainly would not remember what he wished to forget. This appeared very strikingly in the trial of Horne

---

\* Some of our readers will remember that Talleyrand, relating his conversations with Barras at the Luxembourg, or his ride with Lannes over the field of Austerlitz, is one of the figures prominently introduced in Macaulay's picture of the gifted and noble group of men who used to assemble at Holland House in that "venerable chamber, in which all the antique gravity of a college library was so singularly blended with all that female grace and wit could devise to embellish a drawing-room."



Tooke. He was subpoenaed as a witness for the prisoner, and asked as to his recollection of certain passages of civility and intimacy in his early life with Mr. Tooke and other friends of reform. The *Non mi ricordo*, however convenient to the Premier, was damaging enough to the prisoner. Suppose Mr. Fox had been in such circumstances the witness!—who will for a moment imagine he could forget anything that would help a man in danger of his life? But they were *magis pares quam similes*.

"Talleyrand was initiated into public affairs under M. de Calonne, and learnt from that lively minister the happy facility of transacting business without effort and without ceremony in the corner of a drawing-room, or in the recess of a window. In the exercise of that talent, he equalled the readiness and surpassed the wit of his model, but he brought to his work some commodities, which the latter could never supply; viz. great veracity, discretion, and foresight."—P. 35.

"Great veracity" is the last quality which it has been the fashion to attribute to this experienced courtier. Truthfulness was not exactly the quality looked for in the man to whom the *mot* has been commonly assigned, that "the use of language is to conceal our thoughts." Yet how possible it is for an honourable man to labour unjustly and for nearly a life under the imputation of finesse, the want of candour, the case of the late Sir Robert Peel may shew. It was no doubt in reference to the once prevailing impression of Sir Robert Peel's powers of dissimulation, that the Duke of Wellington, in his pathetic *éloge* in the House of Lords, spoke of his former colleague's habitual truth. Facts like these should make us jealous of our prejudices, especially our party prejudices.

The summer and autumn of 1792, when Lord Holland's extended foreign residence and travel began, he spent in Denmark and Prussia. The sketches which he gives of Royal manners and characters at Copenhagen and Berlin, however entertaining, are not calculated to conciliate our admiration of courts and crowned heads. Amidst a series of very different portraits, we look with pleasure on this brief tribute to a Princess whose virtues were, we fear, not appreciated by the nation amongst whom she passed her married life. The late Duchess of York was a Princess of the court of Berlin, daughter of the profligate and finally divorced wife of Frederick William, King of Prussia.

"An education in such a court as Berlin was not likely to produce, and probably did not produce, any great austerity of principle; but the Duchess of York was certainly distinguished through life for the gentleness and frankness of her disposition, the soundness of her judgment, the constancy and generosity of her attachments to her family, her friends, and her dependents. Her understanding was far superior to the illusions which a station such as hers generally creates. She made, indeed, no ostentation of her philosophy, but she silently exerted it, not only in the regulation of her own conduct, but in softening and concealing both the political and private errors of those with whom she was connected. Had her husband lived to be king, the country, as well as he, would have seen fresh reasons for regretting her untimely end. As Duchess of York, her unobtrusive character concealed many of her good and shining qualities from the eye of the publick. A disdain of popularity in high rank, combined with endowments to command it, has, at least, the merit of rarity and self-denial; and I trust it is a pardonable digression in these notes to bear testimony to the virtues of one who from that motive, or from the still more laudable feelings of tenderness for others, forebore, during her

lifetime, to draw upon the publick for her due share of gratitude and applause." Pp. 65—67.

In 1793, Lord Holland visited Spain. This country appears to have obtained a strong hold over his taste and affections. He stayed long in it, and he often returned to it. He became, according to his own statement (p. 69), better acquainted with the events and characters connected with the Spanish Court, than with those of any other on the continent. He made himself perfectly master of the Spanish language and literature. Of these his studies, an admirable monument exists in his *Life of Lopes de Vega*, and his *Translations of Spanish Dramatic Literature*. Though by no means blind to the faults of the Spanish character, he appears to have felt warm admiration of the better qualities that belong, spite of priestly and monarchical crimes, to that people. As soon as the Peace of Amiens was concluded, he revisited Spain, and he continued to reside in Madrid until after the declaration of war. He then visited Portugal, returning to England in 1805, just in time to record his vote in the House of Lords in favour of Catholic Emancipation. When the Spaniards rose to free themselves from the impending yoke of Napoleon, all his old sympathies for the Spanish nation revived. Florida Blanca, Valdez and other Spanish patriots, made him the channel of their communications to Mr. Canning. So deeply did he enter into the struggle, that he embarked on board the Amazon frigate and landed at Corunna almost simultaneously with the division of the British army under Sir David Baird. As the tide of war permitted, he travelled through various parts of the peninsula, and after visiting Cadiz, he went to Lisbon, and thence returned to England about the latter end of the year 1809.\* We afterwards find him visiting the continent in 1810, 1814, 1815 and 1821. This sketch, imperfect as it is, of his foreign travels and residences, sets off the characteristic modesty with which he describes his own qualifications as a writer on continental affairs.

"As a foreigner, however favourable his opportunities, or sound his judgment, seldom relates any English event, or describes any English character, without committing some gross blunder, I check myself with the reflection that I also must be liable to be misled by false information, or to form an erroneous estimate of manners, opinions, and transactions out of my own country. I can only vouch for the anecdotes I record, by assuring my readers that I believe them: I repeat them as they were received and understood by me from what appeared sufficient authority; and I delineate the characters either as the result of my own impressions, or of the opinions conveyed to me by those who were most capable of drawing them correctly."—Pp. 1, 2.

No future history of Spain will be perfect without the assistance of Lord Holland's reminiscences of Godoy, so long known by the title of the Prince of the Peace. For a time his power was boundless. It was based on an intrigue with the Queen. His vices were despicable, his knowledge very slight; but some good qualities redeemed his character, the most honourable of which was a benevolent heart. He outlived his power, and found by bitter experience the hollowness and worthlessness of the homage and adulation offered to the great in their prosperity. The following anecdotes are interesting:

"A young English gentleman of the name of Powell had, before the war

---

\* See the *Annual Register*, 1840.



between England and Spain, engaged either with General Miranda, or some other South American adventurer, in an expedition to liberate the Spanish colonies. He was taken. By law his life was forfeited, but he was condemned by a sentence nearly equivalent to perpetual imprisonment in the unwholesome fortress of Omoa. His father, Chief Justice of Canada, on hearing the sad tidings hastened to England. Unfortunately, hostilities had commenced under circumstances calculated to exasperate the government and people of Spain. The Chief Justice was, however, determined to try the efficacy of a personal application to alleviate the sufferings of his son, by a change of prison, since he despaired of obtaining his release. Having procured passports, he proceeded to Spain, furnished with a letter of introduction to the Prince of the Peace from me, to whom he applied as recently arrived from thence, and not involved in the angry feelings or discussions which had led to the rupture between the two countries. The Prince received him at Aranjuez, and immediately on reading the letter, and hearing the story, bade the anxious father remain till he had seen the King, and left the room for that purpose without ceremony or delay. He soon returned with an order, not for the change of prison, but for the immediate liberation of the young man. Nor was he satisfied with this act of humanity, but added with a smile of benevolence, that a parent who had come so far to render a service to his child would like probably to be the bearer of good intelligence himself, and accordingly he furnished him with a passport and permission to sail in a Spanish frigate then preparing to leave Cadiz for the West Indies. When I saw the Prince of the Peace many years afterwards at Verona, he lamented to me that his situation would be very precarious if Charles IV. were to die, and he was desirous of ascertaining if he could find an asylum in England. The moment I heard of the event I apprehended, in 1819, I related all the above particulars to Lord Liverpool, and solicited a passport for the Prince of the Peace. Lord Liverpool said, that an English passport to a foreigner implied an invitation, and the government were not prepared to *invite* the Prince of the Peace to England; but he authorized and urged me to assure him that he would be unmolested if he arrived there, and enjoy every protection for his person and property that a foreigner was entitled to. The answer of the Prince of the Peace to my communication of this assurance was concise, and to the following purpose:—"He had, for many years, disposed of the resources of one of the richest kingdoms in Europe, he had made the fortune of thousands and thousands, but I was the only mortal who, since his fall, had expressed any sense or shewn any recollection of any service, great or small, received from him. I might therefore judge of the pleasure my letter had given him." He did not however come to England."—Pp. 137—140.

Of Charles IV. and Ferdinand VII. of Spain, Francis II. of Austria, and Alexander of Russia, Lord Holland's portraits are quite characteristic. He does not acquit Alexander of a guilty knowledge of the conspired death of Paul. Most weighty are the conclusions which he draws from this event concerning the terrible curse inflicted on a country by despotism.

"There is no mitigation of the excesses of despotism; violence alone can remove them. Those, therefore, who are in contact with such disorders must, both in principle and practice, be more familiarized with forcible remedies, and more pardonable for applying them, than persons who never have to deal with symptoms so outrageous. The assassination of an Emperor, even by members of his own family, is no uncommon occurrence in Russia or Turkey. It cannot, perhaps it ought not, to excite the same horror there as in more refined and civilized societies. Acquiescence, or even participation, in plots of assassination is not a crime of the same dye in despotick countries as in those where the force of law and the mildness of manners render such bloody expedients unusual and unnecessary. Had Alexander denounced the plot, or even merely defeated the execution of it, he would, in truth, only have post-

poned an event which was inevitable, and in all probability he must either have fallen in the interval a victim to his father's suspicion, or ultimately have shared his fate in order to secure the impunity of the conspirators.

"Such scenes justly excite the abhorrence of good men; but it is not against the actors, but against the system which creates and in some sort requires such guilt, that their indignation should be directed. It has been a fashion of late years, and one much sanctioned by the Prince in question, to consider legitimacy and hereditary right to power as nearly synonymous. But legitimacy, if it means anything, implies a respect and honour for law. Now there is no scheme of government in which the laws of God and nature are so necessarily violated, and in which, practically, those of mankind are so frequently subverted, as in hereditary despotism."—Pp. 181—183.

Nearly one-half of the volume before us is devoted to Napoleon Buonaparte. The admiration which Lord and Lady Holland entertained for this extraordinary man will scarcely be understood by those who were not their contemporaries. Many persons of unquestionable sagacity and benevolence shared their feelings. Admiration of his intellectual powers,—a philosophical perception of the good which, amidst dire calamities and crimes, Napoleon was effecting,—disapprobation of the principles on which the French war was based—principles which, if acted upon by France in 1689, might have prevented the settlement of affairs in England consequent on the Glorious Revolution,—and, especially after Napoleon's downfall, compassion for his sufferings, and a strong moral disapprobation of the petty insults offered to the Great Captive by his petty gaolers,—these, together with the natural reaction consequent on the extravagant load of calumny with which, for party purposes, Napoleon's name had been assailed in England, were the causes of that active sympathy which rather more than thirty years ago affected so large a portion of English society. No persons felt this sympathy more strongly than Lord and Lady Holland. The decision to confine Napoleon in St. Helena, he opposed with admirable courage, and stigmatized as ungenerous. He thought it "unworthy the magnanimity of a great country to consign to distant exile and imprisonment a foreign and captive chief, who after the abdication of his authority, relying on British generosity, had surrendered himself to us in preference to his other enemies." He stigmatized the treaties by which the English Government bound themselves to detain Napoleon in custody at the will of sovereigns to whom he had never surrendered himself, as "repugnant to the principles of equity, and utterly uncalled for by expedience or necessity." However open to objection this opinion may appear, and however liable to Mr. Macaulay's charge of imprudent generosity, there can be no doubt that it was founded on motives both amiable and commendable, viz. generosity towards a conquered enemy, and what Mr. Macaulay admirably terms "the magnanimous credulity of a mind which was as incapable of suspecting as of devising mischief." We must in conclusion find room for some curious particulars respecting Napoleon's religious sentiments.

"He was at all times disposed to converse on metaphysical subjects, and curious in questioning well-informed priests on the foundation and nature of their faith. He was consequently disappointed on finding that the two ecclesiasticks sent out to St. Helena, though selected by Cardinal Fesch, were men of limited understandings, and no reading at all. The old man, Buonavita, though his adventures in Spain, Mexico, and New York, might afford some amusement, was grossly ignorant. He told Napoleon that he resembled the

most able and fortunate of all *Roman* generals, namely *Alexander the Great*. Whether it be true or not that the Emperor condemned him for that historical blunder to read ten pages of Rollin every morning, and to repeat the substance of his lesson to him, he was certainly indignant that so uninteresting a companion had been appointed to attend him.

"Whatever were the religious sentiments of this extraordinary man, such companions were likely neither to fix nor to shake, to sway nor to alter them. I have been at some pains to ascertain the little that can be known of his thoughts on such subjects; and though it is not very satisfactory, it appears to me worth recording.

"In the early periods of the revolution, he, in common with many of his countrymen, conformed to the fashion of treating all such matters, both in conversation and action, with levity and even derision. In his subsequent career, like most men exposed to wonderful vicissitudes, he professed half in jest and half in earnest a sort of confidence in fatalism and predestination. But on some solemn publick occasions, and yet more in private and sober discussion, he not only gravely disclaimed and reproved infidelity, but both by actions and words implied his conviction that a conversion to religious enthusiasm might befall himself or any other man. He had more than tolerance—he had indulgence and respect for extravagant and ascetick notions of religious duty. He grounded that feeling, not on their soundness or their truth, but on the uncertainty of what our minds may be reserved for, on the possibility of our being prevailed upon to admit and even to devote ourselves to tenets which at first excite our derision. It has been observed that there was a tincture of Italian superstition in his character, a sort of conviction from reason that the doctrines of revelation were not true, and yet a persuasion, or at least an apprehension that he might live to think them so. He was satisfied that the seeds of belief were deeply sown in the human heart. It was on that principle that he permitted and justified, though he did not dare to authorize the revival of La Trappe and other austere orders. He contended that they might operate as a safety-valve for the fanatical and visionary ferment which would otherwise burst forth and disturb society. In his remarks on the death of Duroc and in the reasons he alledged against suicide, both in calm and speculative discussion and in moments of strong emotion (such as occurred at Fontainebleau in 1814), he implied a belief both in fatality and providence.

"In the programme of his coronation, a part of the ceremony was to consist in his taking the communion. But when the plan was submitted to him, he, to the surprise of those who had drawn it, was absolutely indignant at the suggestion. 'No man,' he said, 'had the means of knowing, or had the right to say, when or where he would take the Sacrament, or whether he would or not.' On this occasion, he added that he would not, nor did he!

"There is some mystery about his conduct in similar respects at St. Helena, and during the last days of his life. He certainly had mass celebrated in his chapel while he was well, and in his bed-room when ill. But though I have reason to believe that the last Sacraments were actually administered to him privately, a few days before his death, and probably after confession, yet Count Montholon, from whom I derive indirectly my information, also stated that he received Napoleon's earnest and distinct directions to conceal all the preliminary preparations for that melancholy ceremony from all his other companions, and even to enjoin the priest, if questioned, to say he acted by Count Montholon's orders, but had no knowledge of the Emperor's wishes.

"It seems as if he had some desire for such assurance as the Church could give, but yet was ashamed to own it. He knew that some at St. Helena, and more in France, would deem his recourse to such consolation, infirmity; perhaps he deemed it so himself. Religion may sing her triumph, Philosophy exclaim, 'pauvre humanité,' more impartial scepticism despair of discovering the motive, but truth and history must, I believe, acknowledge the fact."—Pp. 312—317.



THE PRESENT STATE OF BIBLICAL CRITICISM AS APPLIED TO  
THE UNITARIAN CONTROVERSY.

IN the year 1830, Professor Henderson, then of Highbury College, thus expressed himself:\* “Indeed, the time seems to have gone by in which it was deemed advisable to support or defend their (the Unitarians’) sentiments by an open and candid application of verbal criticism.” Now while we receive thankfully the concession on the part of this Scottish Calvinist, that Unitarians *had* made an “open and candid application of verbal criticism,” we doubt if Dr. Henderson himself would have granted this during the life-time of Mr. Belsham, that open and manly advocate of the precious truth to which he had attained. But in a lecture delivered at the Southwark Literary Institution in September last, Dr. Henderson placed in evidence the very book above referred to, contenting himself with a mere statement of the result to which he then came, and affirming that no facts brought to light since the publication of that book had led him to modify his statements. Yet I will express my conviction that his conclusions on the important text, 1 Tim. iii. 16, “God was manifested in the flesh,” were uncritical and unscriptural; his reasoning even then (in 1830) was overturned by one of his own school, writing in the *Eclectic Review*; and I shall undertake to shew that the more complete exhibition of the critical evidence since that time has refuted beyond reasonable question the inferences which Dr. Henderson drew from his premises, and materially altered, nay destroyed, the premises themselves.

The subject of Dr. Henderson’s lecture was first announced thus: “The Divinity and Humanity of Jesus;” but upon the delivery of the proposed lecture this was deliberately changed into “The Humanity and Divinity of Jesus.” Was it that, the Humanity being granted by Unitarians, it might be conveniently treated *first*? Yet why treat that subject at all, in a lecture designed to counteract the influence of the Unitarian doctrine? It seemed to me as probable, and this I ventured in a public reply to suggest, that the lecturer wished to avoid the tremendous *fall* from Deity, Supreme Deity, to the state and condition of one of his human creatures. This astounding “doctrine of incarnation, as it is commonly understood,” is most forcibly described in the paradoxes of Lord Bacon, too well known to your readers to be here repeated. I apprehend Dr. H., in this as well as in other matters, defers to the sentiment of Dr. J. Pye Smith, who himself departs from the ordinary mode of describing the incarnation of the Deity, and talks of the Deity “taking the man Christ Jesus into union with himself,” which, if understood literally, can hardly be regarded as a whit more plain or reasonable than the common or Athanasian statement.

Under the first head, the *humanity*, the lecturer aimed to produce an unfavourable impression by referring to a few hackneyed expressions found in Priestley and Belsham, not fairly and candidly cited from them, nor subject to the inferences which the Trinitarian advocate would draw. But such inferior points I chose to pass by, and directed

---

\* Preface to his work entitled, “The Great Mystery of Godliness incontrovertible” (what Christian, whether Trinitarian or Unitarian, ever doubted it?) “or Sir Isaac Newton and the Socinians foiled.”

the minds of my audience to the main question, Do the Scriptures inculcate the doctrine of the personal deity of Christ, as well as the humanity? It is obvious that the truth or falsehood of the miraculous conception, or even the sinlessness of Christ's humanity, forms no proper part of this question, and to dwell upon it would only tend to divert the attention from the main question at issue. Unitarians were well taught by Mr. Yates, in his controversy with Dr. Wardlaw, 35 years ago,\* the advantage of keeping to the broad view of the subject.

Dr. Henderson proceeded to adduce the scriptural proofs of his peculiar doctrine of the deity of the Saviour, and was pleased to announce it by the use of the one word *θεανθρωπος* (*theanthropos*). I think he did not give the English translation, ill-sounding, uncouth, and without authority from Scripture, *God-man*. Why, it was urged in reply, should he go out of the sacred record in search of a word, however convenient to express his opinion, which is never found in Scripture, and which in ecclesiastical antiquity dates from Chrysostom of Constantinople?† If apostles and evangelists had the idea in *their* theology, why should they not have had the word, which so conveniently and fitly expresses it? They could then teach "the truth as it is in Jesus," without the jargon of *God-man*; why cannot the teachers of Christianity, professing to adhere to primitive simplicity, do the same now?

Proceed we to the scriptural proof. Dr. Henderson deserves credit for recognizing, except in one remarkable instance, the revision which the text of the Greek Testament has received in modern times, and for avoiding the greater number of the vulnerable points characteristic of former Trinitarianism. The defence of *θεανθρωπος* by Robert Robinson in his earlier days, or even that of Baptist Noel only fifteen years ago, would exhibit many weaker parts which Henderson has judiciously disregarded. Though many Trinitarians rest their faith on Acts xx. 28, 1 John iv. 6, 1 John v. 7, or even the interpolated word *God* in the mention of Stephen's address, Acts vii. 59 (I doubt, however, whether our common Translators meant here to construct an argument for the deity of Christ), their arguments formed no part of Dr. Henderson's cautious defence. It is true that his selected evidences appeared more slender on this account; yet the deficiency was in part supplied by a confidence and yet a coldness of *manner*, and by the stress laid on the comparatively modern proof, not Athanasian, but Calvinistic, or rather Sabellian, attempted to be drawn from the peculiar use of the Greek article, used by the more popular divines of the present day, who aim to make up by a positive maintenance and iteration of their own fragment of orthodoxy, for the many broad and essential parts of the so-called Catholic faith which they presume to disregard. How true this was of Dr. Adam Clarke, many of your readers know. It is scarcely less so with the school to which Dr. Henderson confessedly belongs, that of the acute and impassioned Wardlaw, of the learned and laborious, candid but illogical and inconsequential

---

\* Mr. Yates's valuable Vindication of Unitarianism has been just republished in a 4th edition, revised, and forms certainly one of the best English defences of the great doctrine of the Divine Unity.

† Who died in the beginning of the fifth century.

reasoner, Dr. John Pye Smith, whose Scripture Testimony to the Messiah I long since expected would liberalize the rising generation of *Independent* students,—an anticipation abundantly realized by the more liberal sentiments of many of them in the present day.

Dr. Henderson's scriptural proof of the deity of Christ included the following parts. He first conceded that no instance occurs during the ministry, in which Jesus Christ applied the word *God* to himself. This important and valuable concession,—as old, however, as Erasmus,—the rejoinder made full use of, and shewed, in opposition to Dr. H., that it constitutes a just and important part of the Unitarian argument. If Christ had applied this term to himself in even one clear instance, how inestimable would that have appeared to the present orthodox!

Secondly, he maintained that when the Jews charged him with claiming deity in effect, he did not repel the charge. How completely this is opposed to the reasoning in John x. 34—37, was shewn. Before the high-priest, the lecturer contended that Jesus admitted that he was the Son of God, as if that were equivalent to *God the Son*; and even that he *died* to prove that he was God. It is unnecessary to point out how such an assertion would be met by a Unitarian.

In the third place, Dr. H. proceeded to adduce the passages on which a learned Calvinist acquainted with the present state of the controversy could alone lay stress; in *some* of these, with so little plausibility, as to excite our surprise that a cultivated mind, of good sense in other matters, can so readily discard that quality in the affairs of religion. As classified and placed chronologically, which the lecturer failed to do, these passages present the following results. St. Paul's thirteen Epistles yield only three instances, consisting of a departure from Griesbach and Lachmann, in 1 Tim. iii. 16, a dependance on modern punctuation, Rom. ix. 6 (the Alexandrine MS. among its few points has here adopted what may be called the Unitarian punctuation), and one passage, Titus ii. 13, which requires the new application of the Greek article; or if we admit it to have been known and adopted in earlier times (how early?), as indeed it was, was deliberately and perseveringly rejected by the learned Translators in the reign of James I. But as to the first of the three *Pauline* instances, unfortunately for Dr. Henderson's book, and the attempt to shew that Sir Isaac Newton and the Unitarians—long may they be proud of such exalted company!—were foiled,—his 174 MS. proofs of the reading *θεος*, God, thus turn out in the crucible of Lachmann's margin to his second volume, just published in time to be held up to Dr. Henderson's discomfiture. Four *ancient* authorities are wrested from him, and exhibited as incontestable evidences that St. Paul in that passage used a pronoun, and not the noun *θεος*; and as to the hundred and seventy, they are all so modern, representing only the reading of the Greek church shortly before the invention of printing, that in agreement with his rigid principle, they *all* disappear in his view of material witnesses—they vanish like a dream! Hereafter, Dr. Henderson will have to overturn Lachmann, if he can, by some other process of reasoning than by carping at recensions, as some (e. g. Dr. Laurence) have imagined they could vanquish Griesbach. I venture to express a decided opinion after examination, that the phrase, "God was manifest in the flesh," however easy it would be for a Unitarian to understand it *if it were scripture*, is not scriptural. No instance occurs



from Genesis to Revelation in which a scriptural writer uses this phrase, so natural and so proper if "the doctrine of the incarnation as commonly understood," were the doctrine of the Bible.

Of the remaining examples urged by Dr. H. one, Heb. i. 8, is applied by an unknown author. The passage in the Psalm from which it was taken is at least ambiguous. The most literal and grammatical construction, I think, especially when taken with the context, "God, thy God," &c., is unfavourable to Trinitarianism. One other instance, from the *Unitarian* Peter, if ever man were Unitarian, 2 Pet i. 1, requiring also the new view of the Greek article, is found in a text, as well as the last instance indeed, which, according to Eusebius in ancient, and Lardner in modern times, must not be alleged as affording alone sufficient proof of any doctrine.

We have now remaining two texts only, from all the writings of St. John, in which that apostle is considered by Dr. Henderson as having applied the term God to Jesus. His very first example, John i. 1, however, applies *θεος* not to Jesus, but to *the Word*, and requires the separate and previous proof that these two are identical; but on this ancient and modern interpreters have been divided, and no correct reasoner will assume this point at the outset, however prevalent the notion be in the communion to which he belongs, or however necessary it be to the truth of the doctrine which he advocates.

In the first supposed example, 1 John v. 20, the notable text to one of Dr. Wardlaw's discourses, expressed thus, *Jesus Christ. This is the true God and eternal life*, it requires only the smallest acquaintance with the irregularities of syntax, with the variæ lectiones, and with the current distinctions and usages of this apostle, to know that the sense for which Dr. H. would contend cannot possibly be the meaning of the sacred author. If any doubt the just grammatical construction, he may consult an admirable critique by the German Lücke, inserted in Vol. V. of the *Christ. Ref.*, pp. 718—720, and his doubts must assuredly vanish. It may be confidently expected, that as the just principles of New-Testament interpretation prevail in the various sects, Trinitarians will become ashamed of the argument attempted to be derived from this passage at least, and betake themselves to arguments yielding a more apparent support.

The remainder of Dr. Henderson's lecture was occupied in stating the commonly alleged arguments from the attributes and qualities ascribed to Christ, which require little observation, and were but briefly insisted on in the reply. With far greater force, the Unitarian points to the high titles which, in many hundred instances enumerated by Dr. Samuel Clarke, are appropriated to God even the Father, and incontestably prove his supreme Deity; while the express denial of perfect knowledge by our Saviour in one remarkable instance, ignores all the arguments urged to prove his omniscience; his express and repeated reference to the Almighty as the source of all his power, sets aside completely the pretended proofs of his omnipotence; the indubitable facts of his death and resurrection, lying as they do at the basis of our common Christianity, reduce his asserted eternity and original immortality to an idle dream.

B. MARDON.

Boxworth Grove, January, 1851.

## DR. PRIESTLEY.

WE have recently had the good fortune to meet with a very interesting series of autograph letters to and from Dr. Priestley, extending from the year 1790 to 1802. They form a thin folio volume, which, through the praiseworthy intervention of John Fitchett Marsh, Esq., the Town Clerk of Warrington, has been recently deposited in the Museum and Library of that town. These valuable illustrations of the latter years of Dr. Priestley's life have never been perused by his biographers. They form a portion of the papers of the late Mr. John Wilkinson, Priestley's brother-in-law, and coming into Mr. Marsh's hands as legal adviser of Mr. Wilkinson's daughter, he saw at once the importance of their being secured for public use, and obtained her permission to deposit them in the Library. We proceed to give our readers some account of these letters, with copious extracts, confining ourselves in the present article to a portion of the letters written in England. We shall prefix to some of the letters a few illustrative remarks, beginning with some particulars of Mr. John Wilkinson (to whom most of the letters are addressed), gathered from casual notices of him in Priestley's Memoirs, from local traditions and other sources.

Mr. John Wilkinson was the eldest son of Isaac Wilkinson, an iron-master at Earthig, near Wrexham. The family at Earthig consisted of two sons, John and William, and two daughters. William was a pupil of Priestley's at Nantwich, and appears to have removed with him in 1761 to Warrington Academy. In the following year Dr. Priestley married, at the beautiful church at Wrexham,\* —, the youngest daughter of Isaac Wilkinson. "This proved," wrote Dr. Priestley, "a very suitable and happy connection, my wife being a woman of an excellent understanding, much improved by reading, of great fortitude and strength of mind, and of a temper in the highest degree affectionate and generous; feeling strongly for others and little for herself. Also greatly excelling in everything relating to household affairs, she entirely relieved me of all concern of that kind, which allowed me to give all my time to the prosecution of my studies, and the other duties of my station." Mr. Wilkinson, Sen., fell into difficulties in the latter part of his life, and became entirely dependent on his sons. They were enterprising and very successful miners and iron-masters. John was especially so, having works in the neighbourhood of Birmingham, in Denbighshire, Staffordshire, Shropshire, Lancashire, and at Passy, near Paris. He was, in both politics and religion, resolutely attached to liberal views. To Dr. Priestley he acted, on the whole, with kindness and liberality, although, as this correspondence will shew, he did not fulfil in respect to Priestley's sons the expectations which

---

\* He was accompanied on the occasion, as groomsmen, by Rev. Thomas Threlkeld, then minister of the little Presbyterian congregation at Risley, four miles distant from Warrington. In his interesting memoir of Mr. Threlkeld, Dr. Barnes mentions the amusing fact of his becoming so deeply immersed, as soon as he entered the church, in the study of a Welsh Bible, that he forgot that he had undertaken an important post in the service. When the bride was to be given away, the representative of the father did not appear. He was sought for in the spacious church, and discovered in a large and lofty pew, wholly unconscious of what was passing around him!

his kindness to their father had not unnaturally excited. When, in 1780, the engagement with Lord Shelburne was brought to a close, Dr. Priestley was led to fix on Birmingham as a place of residence, at the suggestion of his brother-in-law, John Wilkinson, who then lived in that neighbourhood. The house was in fact provided by Mr. Wilkinson. After the riots, as these letters shew, he offered any of his houses as a refuge to Dr. Priestley, and both then and afterwards gave him liberal pecuniary aid. Castle-head, to which Dr. Priestley alludes as a favourite place of retirement and study, is a singularly romantic and beautiful seat. It is situated in the township of Upper Allithwaite, in the parish of Cartmel, in the hundred of Lonsdale, and is supposed, from coins and other remains there, to have once had a Roman inhabitant. It had been utterly neglected until Mr. Wilkinson purchased the property and saw its capabilities. He cut various romantic walks, and planted trees and ornamental shrubs on the heights and slopes. In effecting these alterations he dug up many ancient remains, including coins (of the age of Constantine), rings, fossil remains of animals, such as are no longer found in England. These were carefully arranged and preserved in the house, Dr. Priestley, it is said, assisting in the work. The house is built at the foot of the conical or castellated rock which gives the name to the place. The beauty of the situation is greatly heightened by the confluence of the rivers Winster and Ken. At high water the house is accessible only by a narrow causeway, and the entrance was secured by strong iron gates. A portion of the estate was an island called the Holme. Castle-head was the favourite residence of its owner. He is still remembered and talked of by the old inhabitants of the district as an energetic, but eccentric and not amiable man. In domestic life he was not happy. To other less innocent causes of alienation, religious differences between his wife and himself were added. She was a regular attendant at Lindale church, whither she vainly endeavoured to persuade her husband to accompany her. His non-attendance at church, coupled with his free opinions, excited against him in that bigoted age the cry of infidelity. This was not allayed by his determination to lie in unconsecrated earth. His tomb was prepared in his own beautiful grounds, and an iron coffin and a huge metallic mausoleum, weighing twenty tons, were prepared to cover the body. He died July 14, 1808, the seventeenth anniversary of the Birmingham riots. The superstitious peasants of that district observed the proceedings of his funeral without respect or sympathy, and thought it an ill omen that the hearse on its way from the house to the mausoleum sank into a quicksand. The latter days of Mr. Wilkinson had been embittered by family strife and a Chancery-suit between himself and his brother William respecting some mine property and rights. The decision was adverse to John Wilkinson. On the tomb, these lines, written by himself, were inscribed: "DELIVERED FROM PERSECUTION OF MALICE AND ENVY, HERE RESTS JOHN WILKINSON, IRON-MASTER, IN CERTAIN HOPES OF A BETTER STATE AND HEAVENLY MANSION, AS PROMULGATED BY JESUS CHRIST, IN WHOSE GOSPEL HE WAS A FIRM BELIEVER. HIS LIFE WAS SPENT IN ACTION FOR THE BENEFIT OF MANY, AND HE TRUSTS IN SOME DEGREE TO THE GLORY OF GOD."

The remains of John Wilkinson were not allowed to *rest* many years in the spot which he selected before death for his burial. The estate



of Castle-head was after a time of necessity sold, to meet the claims of creditors. The purchaser was Mr. Fitchett, of Warrington. Subsequently, it was sold to Mr. Wright, who is, we believe, its present possessor. He insisted, as a condition of sale, on the removal of the body of the former owner of the estate. The remains were removed to the churchyard at Lindale, and deposited in the grave of Mrs. Wilkinson. Mr. Wilkinson had made the mistake, into which men of great vigour of purpose sometimes fall, of supposing that he could, by means of a trust-deed, exercise an almost endless influence over his property. He directed his mines to be worked by his trustees. The result was pecuniary loss and embarrassment, from which they extricated themselves only by the sale of the property.

The first letter in the volume is from Joseph Priestley the younger to his uncle and employer, asking his sanction to the writer's marriage with Miss Ryland, he having obtained the consent of his own father and hers. The letter bears date March 26, 1789. The writer was in his twenty-first year. He had been previously at Geneva in a mercantile house, under the patronage of his uncle, William Wilkinson. Subsequently, he entered the counting-house of Messrs. Vaughan, of London, and Mr. Russell, of Birmingham. About two years before the date of the letter, he had been in a manner adopted by his uncle John, but, as it would appear, without a definite explanation of the views and purpose of his relative. Of this excellent man, who lived until 1833, a valuable memoir, from the pen of Mr. Kentish, will be found in the first Series of the *Christian Reformer*, XIX. 499.

Mr. Samuel Ryland,\* the father of Elizabeth, was brother to Mr. John Ryland, whose house, Easy Hill (Baskerville House), was burnt.† His daughter Elizabeth had been a catechumen of Dr. Priestley. An anecdote is told of her that she once asked her pastor "How he reconciled the foreknowledge of God with the free will of man?" The Dr. answered her with a smile, that it had perplexed the greatest philosophers and divines to answer that question. She was the author of a short and simple Catechism on the Lord's Supper. This amiable woman lived to the year 1816. Mr. Kentish, speaking from personal knowledge, describes her as combining "superior powers of taste and judgment, and truly enlightened principles of conduct, with the most affectionate feelings and attractive manners."

#### LETTER II.

*Dr. Priestley to John Wilkinson, Esq. (Broseley).*

Birmingham, September 2, 1790.

Dear Sir,—Not having had the pleasure of seeing you at Birmingham, as I expected, since I had some conversation with you on the subject of Joseph, in London, it is necessary for me to inform you by writing of what passed between me and Mr. Ryland relating to it. Having, I believe, a very good opinion of my son, he was much pleased with your approbation of his marriage with his daughter. He was

\* It was this Mr. Ryland who, on the fatal evening of the riots, drove up in a chaise to Dr. Priestley's doomed house to remove him to a place of safety. See the very interesting "Journal relating to the Birmingham Riots," by one of the Russell family, C. R. (2nd Series) Vol. II. p. 294.

† See Knight's *Popular Tumults*, p. 100.

worth, he told me in confidence, notwithstanding his late great losses, about seven thousand pounds, and that his circumstances were improving; that after his death and that of his wife, all that he should be worth would be divided between the two daughters; but that, his money being engaged in trade, he could not conveniently spare more than about five or six hundred pounds at present.

He neither expects nor desires any great things for his daughter, but wishes her not to marry a man-servant. As to the manner in which you may think proper to place him above that rank, he was quite indifferent.

Though I would not have Joseph to be in any haste to marry, yet I am persuaded you will agree with me that, when other circumstances are not unfavourable, pretty early marriages are on many accounts advisable, especially as family connections give a steadiness to the character that is seldom acquired in an unmarried state. Besides, Miss Ryland is but about a year younger than Joseph.

As I wish not to trouble you often with letters, I shall take the opportunity of joining with your sister in requesting that you would extend your kindness to our son William, as you have done to his brother. Our expectations from his uncle William being now over, we have no other resource; and your brother himself, the last time the subject was mentioned, intimated as much.

Both my sons, I hope, have good principles, so as to be faithful to any trust reposed in them, and grateful for any favour that may be shewn them. What Joseph's capacity for business is, you will now be a sufficient judge of. William will not, I think, be inferior to him. He writes a better hand, and is master of High Dutch as well as French.

I expect him home in less than a month, and shall get some of my friends to take him into their counting-house for a few months; and as Mr. and Mrs. Galton have always shewn a partial kindness to him, I shall apply there in the first (*instance\**).

With a truly grateful sense of all your favours, I am, with your sister's best respects, dear Sir, yours sincerely,

J. PRIESTLEY.

P. S. You declined taking a copy of the new edition of my philosophical work till your return from London. I wish to send it, together with some other publications, to your order.

#### LETTER IV.

*Dr. Priestley to John Wilkinson, Esq.*

Dear Sir,—I was not able to answer yours till after my return from Leeds, where I received it, and till I had seen Joseph, who I find has written to you on the subject. It gives me concern to find that he should feel so much reluctance to going to Bersham; but I hope you will have the goodness to consider his various attachments to this neighbourhood, and still more his having always had the idea of his being destined for Bradley, in the business of which he took particular pleasure, and was ambitious of distinguishing himself, as some excuse for him, though the disappointment should affect him more sensibly

---

\* Sheet torn at this part by the seal.

than it ought to do. He is, however, determined to comply with your wishes, whatever they be, and to exert himself to the utmost to do whatever you require of him; and he says he wrote his real sentiments with the more freedom, as he understood that you wished to know them, and had formed no absolute plan with respect to him.

As to Mr. Ryland's business, Joseph will give you good reasons why, besides his having no knowledge of it or affection for it, his entering into it cannot be proposed to Mr. Ryland.

I am truly grateful for the kindness you express to William, and as he is considerably older than Joseph was when he returned from abroad, and Joseph says he can soon teach him the nature of book-keeping, he may, if you have no objection, be placed immediately at Bradley.

Be assured that I retain the most grateful sense of your kindness to me and to my children. When my two elder sons are disposed of, I hope I shall be able to provide for Harry in the line that I wish him to take; so that I can with particular satisfaction devote myself to my favourite, and I hope not unuseful, pursuits.

With my best wishes that you may pass the close of life with as much satisfaction as you enable me to do mine, I am, with gratitude as to a friend, and affection as to a brother, dear Sir, yours sincerely,

J. PRIESTLEY.

Birmingham, Oct. 11, 1790.

Mr. Wilkinson appears to have been unwilling to fulfil the expectations he had raised, and in the end offered to Joseph Priestley the younger a very inadequate salary, and burthened the offer with the condition of his residing at a distance from Birmingham. The connection between the uncle and nephew was broken off, and very little intercourse afterwards took place between them. The mildness and forbearance with which Dr. Priestley bore the disappointment are remarkable. His friendship with his brother-in-law, if for a moment checked, was not interrupted.

In the P. S. to the eighth letter, dated Birmingham, Jan. 20, 1791, Dr. Priestley writes to Mr. Wilkinson,

"I am pleased to hear that you liked my Letters to Mr. Burke. We are printing the third edition,—one thousand for each of the two first, and fifteen hundred for this."

In the 9th letter, Dr. Priestley informs Mr. W. that his son Joseph has a prospect of settling at Manchester, in partnership with Mr. Ashworth, in the mercantile line.

#### LETTER XI.

*Dr. Priestley to Mr. Wilkinson (Castle-head, Lancaster).*

London, No. 72, St. Paul's, Aug. 20, 1791.

Dear Sir,—You were so obliging as to give me an invitation to any of your houses in the present unsettled state of my affairs, and having continued here nearly as long as was convenient for me, on account of receiving and answering letters, I shall be happy, with your leave, to spend a month or six weeks at Castle-head, especially as I understand that you are there yourself. I never shall forget how agreeably I passed my time there before, and what satisfaction I had in composing several of my works in your *wren's nest*. There I wish to finish *An Appeal*



that I am writing *to the Public on the Subject of the Riots in Birmingham*, which I intend to publish, not immediately, but some time hence, when it will probably have a greater effect.

My son William is with me, and as unsettled as myself. He was to have been three years with Mr. Russell, in order to his being afterwards settled in America. But as it is now probable that I shall not return to Birmingham, it will be an uncomfortable place for him. He exposed himself much in the riots in saving what he could of our things, and was so marked by the rioters as to be in much danger. Besides, the great fatigue he underwent required some recruit. He therefore came hither, and is very useful to me as an amanuensis, and in that capacity, if you please, I will bring him with me to Castle-head. We must, however, stay at least a fortnight longer here.

The Dissenters at Birmingham have been very much dispirited, but they now begin to take courage in consequence of having discovered some very foul practices of their adversaries, which must expose them to infamy. The particulars Mr. Russell forbears to mention; but, among other things, he has in his possession a forged letter which was made use of to inflame the mob, both at my house and his. The magistrates, who deserve the severest punishment, have had the thanks of a town's meeting and presents voted them, and Mr. Galton informs me that they have sent an Address to *the King* so fulsome and abject, as must disgrace them for ever, while that of the Dissenters is manly and does them credit.

Your sister must continue at Heath,\* in expectation of Sally being soon brought to bed. Whether she can join me at Castle-head is uncertain. She has been chiefly at Mr. Galton's, though his house was often threatened for receiving her. Nothing can exceed the rage of the High-Church party.

I thank God, I never enjoyed better health or spirits than I have done since this affair, nor has it lost me a minute's sleep, except in consequence of being driven about four nights running without being able to go to bed, except for a few hours.

With my best respects to Mrs. Wilkinson, I am, with gratitude and respect, yours sincerely,

J. PRIESTLEY.

P. S. It is most probable that I shall settle in or near London.

The next letter is from Mr. Galton, whose name has already occurred in one or two of the letters. The highly-respected family of this name were Quakers residing near Birmingham. Both Mr. Galton, Sen., and his son Samuel were contributors to the subscription made with a view to defray the expense of Dr. Priestley's philosophical experiments. Samuel Galton, the noble-minded correspondent of Dr. Priestley, was read out of the Society of Friends on account of his trade, that of a gun-maker. He lived at Duddestone Hall, which still stands, but is now used as a private lunatic asylum. He had been a Warrington student, but subsequently to Dr. Priestley's connection with the Academy, entering in the year 1769, being a class-fellow of the late estimable Richard Bright, Esq., of Bristol. Mr. S. Galton was, with

---

\* Heath Forge, the residence of Mr. Finch, who had married Dr. Priestley's daughter.

Dr. Priestley, Dr. Darwin, Mr. Boulton and others, one of the Lunar Society,—a scientific club which dined together once a month near the full of the moon. The worthy wife of Mr. Galton was very warmly attached to Mrs. Priestley. She was a member of the well-known family of the Barclays. The invitation of these highminded persons Dr. Priestley was prevented from accepting. In fact, he never re-visited Birmingham after the riots.

## LETTER XII.

*Mr. Galton to Dr. Priestley.*

Dear Sir,—I have this moment only received your favour by Mr. W. Priestley, and rejoice most sincerely in the idea of seeing you.

If you incline to come to Birmingham, which I think much better and more honourable, pray inform me the hour you expect to arrive, and where, for I will meet you at the coach and accompany you in your perambulation about the town, happy in the occasion to avow the most explicit attachment to a person whose friendship does me the greatest honour. If you leave the coach at what was once your house, I will meet you there. It never shall be said that Dr. Priestley was not received with open arms by one on whom he has conferred such obligations. The idea of fear Mrs. Galton and myself equally despise, nor do we really think there is any danger; but if the alternative were that we should lose our house or our esteem for ourselves, would one pause a moment?

Our Lunar meeting will be held on Monday at Barr. Will that influence you to leave London any sooner?

The inveteracy of the High, or, in the literal sense, the Low Church, is, I fear, such as to preclude all idea of reconciliation. Yet I believe Administration sincere, and I do earnestly hope that no ground of offence may be given them in your Appeal; and as for the malignant spirits here and in the Church, I would treat them with silent contempt, but not with resentment, which will do them too much honour.

I am, in haste for the post, very affectionately yours,

S. GALTON.

Monday, Sept. 5, 1791.

## LETTER XIII.

*Dr. Priestley to Mr. Wilkinson.*

Dear Sir,—With much pleasure I shall accept your repeated invitation to spend some time, in the present interruption of my business and pursuits, at Castle-head, and hope to arrive, accompanied by your sister and my son William, on the 19th or 20th, which I think will be about the time that you say will be most convenient to yourself. If not, we can stay at Lancaster till it be so.

I propose to leave London on Sunday evening next to go to Mr. Galton's, where I hope to find your sister and my son, provided Sally be brought to bed, as I have little doubt she, by that time, will be. In my way, I have promised Mr. Wedgwood to call on him, and may make a short stay there. I had proposed to go by Manchester; but I find, by a letter I received from Joseph, that my friends there are afraid to receive me. Thus the chased deer is avoided by all the herd.

To give you some idea of the state of things at Birmingham, having a cover, I enclose a letter just received from Mr. Galton. I also enclose a DIALOGUE, which has made some noise at Birmingham, from being supposed, in the present state of men's minds, to contain much treasonable matter. It has been represented to be as bad as the hand-bill, and the printer's boy has been in custody. The printer advertised, and says that the writer would appear when called for. At length, they have found nothing treasonable in it.

I have suffered much, as have many others here, from a bilious purging and vomiting for a fortnight past, and only call myself well this day. I have been hardly able to walk at all. I find the disorder has been common in many parts of England. I shall be glad to find that you have escaped.

With my best respects to Mrs. Wilkinson, I am, dear Sir, sincerely and gratefully yours,

London, Sept. 8, 1791.

J. PRIESTLEY.

#### LETTER XIV.

*Dr. Priestley to Mr. Wilkinson.*

Dear Sir,—After our sad disaster at Birmingham, and the hurry in which I have necessarily lived here, I had set my heart, perhaps too much, on a month's quiet at Castle-head, with my wife, and my son William to write for me. But I find that, notwithstanding Mr. Wilkinson's kind letter, which gave her great pleasure, and which I thought would have removed every difficulty, I find that she is so situated, between the condition of Sally and our furnishing a house at Hackney, where I have determined to take up my abode for the present, that she cannot go so far this year, and I must content myself with paying a visit to Mr. Vaughan, at Missenden, in Buckinghamshire, till she can join me here, and I hope it will not be long before I have the satisfaction of seeing you here.

It is now evident from a variety of circumstances that Government is not displeased with the riots at Birmingham. Some of my friends who had occasion to wait on Mr. Dundas, say he did nothing but rail at the Dissenters in general and myself in particular, and Bishop Prettyman, Mr. Pitt's tutor, has lately delivered a flaming charge against us. Also the first sermon that was preached before the King at Weymouth was against sectaries, this being considered as the surest road to preferment.

On this account I consider my stay in this country as very uncertain. Many of (*my*) friends seriously think of going to France, and the neighbourhood of Dijon, in Burgundy, has been pointed out to them as convenient for their manufactures. If this should take place, and my son William get a settlement in France, which I hope my friends there will find for him, I shall probably go too. Joseph says that many Dissenters will probably emigrate from Manchester, and that, if all be well, he will be able to go too in a few years to great advantage. I have been advised by Mr. Vaughan to put the £500 you kindly sent me into the French funds, and the rest of my little property is in the American funds. I wish to have as little in this country as possible. I am told it is the wish of the Ministry to drive me away, and in this we shall soon be agreed.



I hope you received the frank with the *Political Dialogue*; and with my best respects to Mrs. Wilkinson and every good wish, I am, dear Sir, yours sincerely,

J. PRIESTLEY.

*Endorsed, Answered 24 Septem. '91.*

LETTER XV.

*To the Same.*

London, Oct. 4, 1791.

Dear Sir,—I am glad that you approve of my views with respect to France. *Now*, I think, it must be evident to everybody, whether they will acknowledge it or not, that *that* country must rise, and that *this* cannot well go higher. Whether any addition be made to our burdens or not, they must begin to be felt heavier and heavier, and the wretched, illiberal spirit of the Court will make it despicable. Everything has been done by the Court as well as the country to screen the rioters. Not one has suffered merely for the riots, but because they were infamous characters in other respects, and those who gave evidence against them are now exposed to insult and danger.

I think I told you I had the offer of a completely furnished house near Paris. To-day I have received a very flattering address from a society at Thoulouse, in the name of the town and neighbourhood, inviting me to reside in the south of France, and intimating that one of the now vacant monasteries will be destined for my use. I have now, however, absolutely taken a house at Hackney, and have taken measures to fit it up for my use. Whether I shall succeed to Price is uncertain, as some of the more timid part of the congregation are apprehensive of a tumult if I should settle there.

I spoke to Mr. B. Vaughan, who has placed my money in France, and he says he will write to you about yours. There is no person, I believe, in England who is better acquainted with France and French affairs than he is; so that you may depend on any accounts that he may give you, and he wants no zeal to serve me or my friends. He has already placed a considerable sum in the French funds, and many, I doubt not, will soon do the same, as was the case with the American funds, which have risen thirty per cent. since I placed what I could in them. Mr. Russell gets thirty per cent. per annum by some money that he happened to have in their funds at a very critical time.

Hoping to see you ere long, I am, dear Sir, yours sincerely,

J. PRIESTLEY.

P.S. Your sister is now at Missenden (old Mr. Vaughan's) very well. She has seen the house and given orders about it.

---

SPIRITUAL HOUSEWIFERY.

HOUSEKEEPERS, by frequent inspections and attention, preserve the brightness of their furniture and utensils. Because of this daily carefulness, the house does not need often to be "turned out of windows." So must we keep our habits and principles bright and serviceable, if the house of our spirit is to be a comfortable home, and its furnishings beautiful and dear to us. We shall not need great and frequent disturbance of our inward life, if we practise daily order and self-revision.—*T. Lynch.*

## THE LATE REV. WILLIAM WILSON.

THE following inscriptions for the tomb of the late Rev. William Wilson, in the cemetery, Newbury, Berks, have been drawn up by Dr. Wreford, of Bristol.

SACRED TO THE MEMORY OF THE  
REV. WILLIAM WILSON,  
FOR TWENTY YEARS THE MINISTER OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHAPEL,  
NEWBURY;

*Born May 4, 1799. Died March 29, 1850.*

O PLACE of graves, the first loved form receive  
That weeping friends within thy precincts leave,  
No holier dust shall ever mingle here  
Than his who earliest claims the mourner's tear;  
Long o'er his tomb shall drooping Pity bend,  
And mourn the brother, pastor, guide, and friend—  
Mourn for the wit, the wisdom, and the worth  
Which rest with him beneath this bed of earth :  
Rich in the gifts of Genius—richer still  
In Christian graces guiding all his will—  
Of mind serene—of temper kind and mild—  
In suffering patient—quiet as a child,  
In peace he lived, and peace he found in death,  
For Hope and Faith inspired his parting breath :  
But, not confined to this sepulchral sod,  
His spirit springs to meet his Father—God ;  
For him a crown—a wreath immortal blooms,  
And sheds a glory o'er this place of tombs.

As a Christian Pastor,  
and as an active Citizen,  
he commanded the respect, esteem, and gratitude  
of the community with which he was connected :  
but most was he loved, and most is he regretted,  
by those long-cherished friends who, remembering  
the sweetness and serenity of his temper,  
the genius and the wit, the wisdom and the worth,  
which made his society as instructive as it was delightful,  
must, through lives now shaded by his loss,  
preserve among their saddest pleasures  
“the memory of what has been and never more will be.”

Gifted by nature with high intellectual powers,  
and enriched by study with varied and extensive attainments,  
he regarded them all as subordinate to  
that “wisdom which is from above”  
and those graces of the Christian spirit,  
which it was the aim of his life  
to cultivate and exemplify.

Piously submitting to the will of his Heavenly Father,  
he fell asleep in Jesus,  
and now in this bourn of man's earthly pilgrimage,  
which owes its existence to his efforts,  
and to which he led the way by becoming its earliest tenant,  
he rests in humble hope of a blessed immortality—  
a guide in death, as he was in life,  
to others who after him may be gathered  
to this place of graves.

## CRITICAL NOTICES.

*How to make Home Unhealthy.* 12mo. Pp. 82. Chapman and Hall, London.

CANNING once exclaimed, after the House had been under the fangs of an eager statistician for hours, and who had made the most astonishing assertions, backed by figures that would have bothered Cocker himself, "There is nothing so fallacious as figures, except facts;" and the British public, which two years ago evinced some interest in sanitary matters, seems ready to make the same exclamation, under the oppression of voluminous and heavy reports, conflicting figures and contradictory statements. The British public believes the anecdote, "Stop, stop, that will never do, we are proving the wrong thing" (a statistical commentary when figures would prove perverse), and considers the following the receipt for the cooking a sanitary report,—*Take a theory and find figures to support it.* And is the popular belief unfounded? Not altogether. There has been too much squareness, too much neatness, too much support of known theories by marvellously convenient numbers, too much averseness to give results that do not point polarwise, or which contradict previously accepted maxims, too dogmatic a style on a subject yet in its infancy. Sydney Smith used to say that no protection from fire would be afforded to the travelling public till a bishop had been burned alive in a railway carriage; and the sanitary reformers asserted that nothing would rouse the Parliament and the country till some frightful catastrophe had occurred. The catastrophe arrived: a parish beadle was discovered, coffin and all, buried in a Holborn sewer; and near, in the same sewer, a feather bed, typical perhaps of the luxurious ease of his life,—and the country was aroused. Since then an apathetic calm has come over us, undisturbed even in the smallest degree by the memory of the offended manes of the illustrious functionary. A glance at the first line of a sanitary article in a magazine or newspaper is sufficient, and merely leads to an impatient Pshaw! The grave blunders of the Commissioners constituting the Board of Health are not forgotten: how they on first assuming office published a manifesto to the people of England recommending a certain dietary as a cholera prophylactic; how the College of Physicians on the following week published a counter manifesto, shewing the absurdity and injuriousness of the proffered advice; and how, amongst other mistakes, they lent their sanction to the pestilence-spreading process of opening and emptying giant sewers in the most densely-populated parts of Westminster in the summer season. But on account of these and minor faults, let us not commit the injustice of forgetting the benefits which they have conferred on us, or the folly of refusing a great good because it is not a perfect good. The admirable Cholera Reports just issued will prepare the profession and the country to meet the enemy at the gates. The facility for water supply in the large towns, and the stringent clauses in many Police Acts for its distribution, obtained through the influence of the Board, will produce changes in the aspect, health and morals of the country, the amount of which can scarcely be calculated. "The Nuisance and Diseases Prevention Act," with its simple, inexpensive and easily-worked machinery, has done singular service in many districts. Its local unpaid committees, armed with its authority, have in many instances accomplished in a week sanitary changes which years of friendly exhortation would have failed to produce.

In considering the benefits of sanitary reform, it should never be forgotten that it involves the diminution of two of the most pauperizing diseases\* which invade our cities, cholera and typhus fever. They specially attack the able-bodied, wage-getting man, entailing present charges for his attendance and burial, and future expense in the maintenance of his widow and children.

---

\* See Dr. Southwood Smith's Reports.



To a jaded public, the little book, "How to make Home Unhealthy," comes just in the nick of time. Like most Christmas books, it will be read and laughed at; but unlike them, it will be remembered and profited by. The writer wraps himself in the mantle of Rabelais, and, under the guise of pleasantry, enunciates problems of high social moment. In his hands the antique privileges of the cap and bells suffer no abatement. He deals his mocks and gibes without fear or partiality, and if he occasionally becomes riotous, we must look at his motley and remember it is Christmas time. A dozen articles collected from the *Examiner* furnish the little volume, and the fact that the publishers consider them worthy of reproducing in a more permanent form, is of itself a sufficient guarantee of their sprightliness and solid worth. We will give a few extracts, which will, we hope, merely whet our readers' curiosity and tempt to the purchase of the whole.

"Chap. I. *Hints to hang up in the Nursery.*"

"In laying a foundation of ill health, it is a great point to be able to begin at the beginning. You have the future man at excellent advantage when he is between your fingers as a baby. One of Hoffman's heroines, a clever housewife, discarded and abhorred her lover from the moment of his cutting a yeast dumpling. There are some little enormities of that kind which really cannot be forgiven, and one such is, to miss the opportunity of physicking a baby. Now I will tell you how to treat the future pale-face at his first entrance into life.

"A little while before the birth of any child, have a little something ready in a spoon, and, after birth, be ready at the first opportunity to thrust this down his throat. Let his first gift from his fellow-creatures be a dose of physic,—honey and calomel, or something of that kind; but you had better ask the nurse for a prescription. Have ready also, before birth, an abundant stock of pins, for it is a great point in putting the first dress upon the little naked body, to contrive that it shall contain as many pins as possible. The prick of a sly pin is excellent for making children cry; and since it may lead nurses, mothers, now and then even doctors, to administer physic for the cure of imaginary gripings in the bowels, it may be twice blessed: sanitary enthusiasts are apt to say that strings, not pins, are the right fastening for infants' clothes. Be not misled. Is not the pincushion an ancient institution? What is to say, 'Welcome, little stranger!' if pins cease to do so? Resist this innovation. It is the small end of the wedge. The next thing a child would do, if let alone, would be to sleep. I would not suffer that. The poor thing must want feeding; therefore waken it up and make it eat a sop, for that will be a pleasant joke at the expense of nature. It will be like wakening a gentleman after midnight to put into his mouth some pickled herring; only the baby cannot thank you for your kindness, as the gentleman might do."

Chap. II. defends with caustic mockery city burials.

Chap. III. introduces us to an evening party, with an apology for the preliminary making-up of a young lady, especially regarding the self-imposed screw martyrdom of the stays. A Grand Inquisitor would probably have satisfied himself with compressing the thumb; her martyr enthusiasm leads her to apply the screw where it will apply pain as severe, and at the same time sap the functions of life. Under this process the lungs, which have to work for ten or fifteen miles of polka in a vitiated atmosphere at steeple-chase speed, are so compressed that "it becomes about as difficult to them as it would be to you to play the trombone in a china closet."

A night of unwholesome excitement, eating and exertion, is followed by

"To-morrow, when you depart from a late breakfast, having seen your daughter's face, and her boiled mackerel eye, knowing that your wife is bilious, and that your son has just gone out for soda-water, you will feel yourself to be a Briton who has done his duty, a man who has paid something on account of his great debt to civilised society."

"Chap. IV. *The Light Nuisance.*"

"Ladies know that, to keep their faces pale, they pull the blinds down in their drawing-rooms, they put a veil between their countenances and the sun when

they go out, and carry, like good soldiers, a great shield on high, by name a parasol, to ward his darts off. They know better than to let the old god kiss them into colour, as he does the peaches. They choose to remain green fruit; and we all know that to be a delicacy.

"Frequently pestilence itself avoids the sunny side of the street, and prefers walking in the shade. Nay, even in one building, as in the case of a great barrack at St. Petersburg, there will be three calls made by disease upon the shady side of the establishment for every one visit that it pays to the side brightened by the sun; and this is known to happen uniformly, for a series of years. Let us be warned, then. There must be no increase of windows in our houses; let us curtain those we have, and keep our blinds well down. Let morning sun or afternoon sun fire no volleys in upon us. Faded curtains, faded carpets, all ye blinds forbid! But faded faces are desirable."

Our friend appears to be half inclined to teetotalism. In Chap. V. he says,

"Of good wine health requires none, though it will tolerate a little. Our prospect, therefore, when the bottle passes briskly, is encouraging. Is the wine good, we may expect some indigestion; is it bad, who can tell what disorders we may not expect? Hoggins, I know, drinks more than a quart without disordering his stomach. He has long been a supporter of the cause we are now advocating, and therein finds one of his rewards. It is not safe to pinch a tiger's tail,—yet, when the animal is sick, perhaps he will not bite, although you tread upon it heavily. Healthy men and healthy stomachs tolerate no oppression."

In Chap. VI., "Art against Appetite," tea of course comes into notice. This best-abused, least-understood article has engaged the attention of most great writers. Dr. Johnson abused it, and most ungratefully, as a needless, expensive luxury. He would have been satisfied to have seen its use prohibited by Act of Parliament, and yet he drew from it the inspiration for some of his finest works. That it may be abused who can doubt? The scalding tea mixed with gin by the London washerwoman produces a disease *sui generis*, known to every London medical practitioner as washerwoman's dyspepsia.

"Tea we are not quite sure about. Some people say that because tea took so sudden a hold upon the human appetite, because it spread so widely in so short a time, that therefore it supplies a want; its use is natural. Liebig suggests that it supplies a constituent of bile. I think rather that its use has become so general because it causes innocent intoxication. Few men are not glad to be made cheerful harmlessly. In excess, no doubt, it can be rendered hurtful (so can bread and butter); but the best way of pressing it into employment as an æquitudinary aid, is by the practice of taking it extremely hot. A few observations upon the temperature at which food is refused by all the lower animals, will soon convince you that in man—not as regards tea only—but in a great many respects—art has established her own rule, and that the appetite of nature has been conquered."

"Chap. VII. *The Water-party.*

"We said before that sanitary art was in its infancy in this country. It was not so in ancient Rome. Her Cloacæ were models for the world, and within a few years exploratory diggings under the ruins of the Colliseum have brought to light the egg-shaped baked clay draining-pipe, which science again accepts as the most perfect form for this purpose. Our best-drained towns are now all supplied with it. It is somewhat humiliating for us, in these days of vaunted scientific advance, when we can communicate with the rapidity of lightning between distant parts of the earth, when our chemists resolve the diamond into invisible gas, and convert substances as dissimilar as linen and sawdust into sugar, to consider how much of lost science we have to win back from the ancients.

"We are told to regard the habits of an infant world. London, the brain of a vast empire, is advised now to forget her civilization, and to go back some thousand years. We are to look at Persian aqueducts, attributed to Noah's great-grandson,—at Carthaginians, Etruscans, Mexicans,—at what Rome did. It frets us when we are thus driven to an obvious reply. Man in an unripe and half-civilized condition, has not found out the vulgarity of water, for his brutish instinct is not overcome. All savages believe that water is essential to their

life, and desire it in unlimited abundance. Cultivation teaches us another life, in which our animal existence neither gets nor merits much attention. As for the Romans, so perpetually quoted, it was a freak of theirs to do things massively. While they were yet almost barbarians, they built that Cloaca through which afterwards Agrippa sailed down to the Tiber in a boat. Who wishes to see his worship the Lord Mayor of London emerging in his state barge from a London sewer?"

Our pantagrueist thus discourses on the discipline of the sick-room:

"A sick room should, in the next place, be made sad, obtrusively sad. A smile upon the landing must become a sigh when it has passed the patient's door. Our hope is to depress, to dispirit invalids. Cheerful words and gentle laughter, more especially when there is admitted sunshine also, are a moral food much too nutritious for the sick.

"The sick room, in its furniture as well, must have an ominous appearance. The drawers or a table should be decked with physic-bottles. Some have a way of thrusting all the medicine into a cupboard, out of sight, leaving a glass of gaily-coloured flowers for the wearied eyes to rest upon: this has arisen obviously from a sanitary crotchet, and is on no account to be adopted."

Air, exercise and the economy of the bed-room, have each an admirable Chapter, but we must close with an extract from that on dress. The italics are our own.

"Hair upon the head was meant originally to preserve in all seasons an equable temperature above the brain. *Emptying grease-pots into it, and matting it together, we convert it into an unwholesome scull-cap.*

"The neck? Here sanitary people say, How satisfactory it is that Englishmen keep their necks covered with a close cravat, and do not Byronise in opposition to the climate. That is very good; *but Englishwomen, who account themselves more delicate, don't cover their necks; indeed, they do not at all times cover their shoulders.* So, travelling from top to toe, if Englishmen wear thick shoes to protect the feet, our Englishwomen scorn the weakness, and go, except a little fancy covering, barefooted.

"From this point I digress, to note of other garments that the English dress, as now established, does on the whole fair credit to society. To the good gentlemen who poetise concerning grace and the antique, who sigh for togas, stolas, and paludaments, I say, Go to. The drapery you sigh for was the baby-linen of the human race. Now we are out of long-clothes. The present European dress is that which offers least impediment to action. It shews what a man is like, and that is more than any stranger from another world could have detected under the upholstery to which our sculptors cling. The merest hint of a man—shaped as God shaped him—is better than ten miles of folded blanket. Artists cry down our costume, forgetting that if they have not folds of drapery to paint, that is because they have in each man every limb to which they may assign its posture. If they can put no mind into a statue by the mastery of attitude, all the sheets in Guy's Hospital will not twist into a fold that shall be worth their chiselling.

"With women it is different. They have both moral and æsthetic right to drapery; and for the fashion of it, we must leave that to themselves."

---

*Two Letters on Cow-keeping.* By Harriet Martineau. Addressed to the Governor of the Guiltcross Union Workhouse. Second Edition. London—Gilpin.

THESE Letters contain so much practical good sense, and so many suggestions which may prove valuable to cottagers, and to private persons residing in country districts, that we desire to extend the knowledge of them to all our readers. The value of the brief and interesting pamphlet now before us consists very much in the "putting into print the results of as small an experiment as can well be made." So many persons have, like the writer, an acre or two of land at their command, and feel the want of a cow, of poultry, and of a pig, yet want practical knowledge respecting their management. It is here afforded them, very simply and very modestly. Persons, not altogether



inexperienced in farming, may begin to think that Miss Martineau's experience may be worth their attention when they learn that she has succeeded in keeping two cows and supplying the house with vegetables (except the winter potatoes) on an acre and a quarter of ground. Her system is to have the cows for the most part kept up in their stalls, to keep them as clean as possible, and to husband for the land with the greatest care all the manure. The land is carefully prepared by draining and by the removal of stones, and, where necessary, the importation of soil.

"The ground being ready, our method is this:—In August we sow cabbage seed, and by the end of September we begin to set out the young plants, about 400 per week, for six weeks, to secure a succession. We set them in rows, about 18 inches apart, and the rows a yard apart. In April and May we sow swedes and beets, in alternate rows, between the rows of cabbages. By the time we are beginning to cut the cabbages, the turnips and beets are past the danger of the fly, and may be thinned—the removal of the cabbages letting in air and sunshine. We also keep a portion of the ground for Belgian carrots, which afford excellent cow food. We succeeded less with these this year than with our other crops, from their not being sufficiently thinned. But we had 25 stone of them; and four or five carrots a day were very acceptable to the cows. By the end of March the cows can get a bite in the pasture, and the mowings of grass in the orchard, &c. are brought to them fresh. While the pasture is shut up for hay, the cabbages ripen. They weigh from 4 to 12 lbs, and each cow eats about eighteen per day. This is their food from June to November, with such grazing as they get after our haymaking, and a handful or two per day of Indian meal, scalded and given with their grass."

In January, this year, the cows were reported to yield ten quarts per day each. In October, the two yielded 25 quarts daily. In his *Cottage Economy*, Cobbett estimates the daily average produce at 5 quarts per cow. Miss Martineau's prime-minister in the administration of her little farm is a very extraordinary working-man, named "Robert," whose praises she celebrates in strains sufficiently high to turn the good man's brain.\* The strangest part of the story is, that this pattern farm-servant, a prodigy of industry, skill, thoughtfulness and economy, was taken with his wife from the *Guilfeross union workhouse*! Well may our benevolent authoress exult in the success of her plan, if "it provides for the maintenance of two honest people, who might otherwise have had no prospect but of the workhouse in their old age, and in all seasons of pressure in the meanwhile." By what strange conjuncture of circumstances this worthy couple had found their way into an union workhouse is not explained. The glimpses of Robert and his wife in their trim cottage are sufficiently picturesque for one of the charming little tales which our authoress so well knows how to compose.

"I really wish you could see how these good people, whom you put in the way of this new life, enjoy everything. I find them now so well and merry, that it is delightful to see them. Robert has been sending money to his old father—a large sum for a working man. His wife has had abundant employment in taking in washing all the summer. When I came home to breakfast this morning, I saw something flying along behind the trees; it was Robert, with two monstrous cabbages in his great barrow, full of joy at their weight. \* \* \* He was very clever when he came; he is much cleverer now. He could not possibly be more industrious; but he is in stronger health and in glorious spirits. His pretty porch is grown over with roses; and there are climbing plants about his walls, and balsams and geraniums in his window."

---

\* We suppose Robert is the agent employed by Miss Martineau in the mesmeric cure effected on her cow, when sick and given over by the usual medical attendant of the shippin. Robert is doubtless a clever fellow, and if he believes, on good grounds, in the reality of the cure by mesmeric passes, has his fortune made. But he is probably too sensible a man to leave the service of a generous mistress who gives him credit for all his good qualities. We do not regret that Miss M. has kept this case of mesmeric farriery out of her *Letters on Cow-keeping*.

The Letters contain hints about the keeping of pigs and poultry, which are the more valuable and may inspire the more confidence that they record disasters and failures as well as success.

We recommend this little tract, and Mr. James Main's on Cottage Gardening, as particularly suitable for distribution in villages.

*Forms of Prayer for Public Worship.* Third Edition, Revised and Enlarged. Pp. 164. London—Whitfield.

WE have here a very neat and improved edition of the Eight Services and other Forms prepared originally for the use of the Brook-Street congregation, Manchester, by Rev. John James Tayler. They who, from their knowledge of the editor, anticipate in this manual of devotions a becoming spirituality and pure taste, will not be disappointed. Four of the Services, slightly abbreviated and improved in their arrangement, are derived from the Forms previously in use by the congregation in Mosley Street. It was of this Prayer-Book that Dr. Parr expressed his approbation in the letter inserted in our last number (p. 25). The four Services compiled by Mr. Tayler are in our estimation (after a weekly use of the entire volume during ten years) more than equal to the others. In the Sixth Service there is inserted the sublime prayer, said to be composed by Dr. Barham, of Exeter, beginning, "O Hallowed Being;" and in the Eighth Service a very touching prayer, which has thrilled to the hearts of many mourners, relating to the memory of the righteous dead.

One distinctive feature of this edition is the omission in the several Services of the Psalms for chanting. But upwards of forty Psalms are inserted at the end of the Services, from which the minister may choose a chant to be used between the two lessons. By this improved arrangement he may make the chant congenial with the other parts of the Service. New intercessory prayers are introduced into six of the Services. In the Marriage Service, considerable use has been made of the dignified, impressive Form adopted by the Presbyterian Ministers of London. We prefer Mr. Tayler's address to theirs, but do not see sufficient reason for the other changes introduced. Mr. Tayler offers some counsel respecting the mode of giving the responses, which deserves the serious consideration of our congregations using a printed Form of Prayer. The neglect of this counsel gives a formality and coldness to a Liturgy which do not necessarily belong to it. How impressive and affecting is the Afternoon Service in the Book of Common Prayer, where the congregation generally and fervently unite in uttering the responses!

"If any Congregations should think fit to adopt these Services, it is earnestly recommended that at least their younger members should be accustomed and even taught (if needful, in classes formed for the purpose) to join distinctly and audibly in the responses. A Liturgy is distinguished from other forms of devotion as an act of social worship, in which the Minister and the People alike take part, and join together in lifting up their voices to God. This is its proper excellence and beauty. It then only deserves the charge of formalism, when the really social part of the service is performed by deputy—either through the solitary ejaculations of the Clerk, or the more refined expedient of a paid Choir. The Choir should be in the people themselves."—Preface, pp. xiv, xv.

### *Unitarian Sermons on the Papal Aggression.*

(Second Notice.)

MR. WICKSTEED'S lecture, entitled "The Way to meet and treat the Papal Letters," is inferior in vigour of thought and style to none of the publications on this topic. Leeds has witnessed sufficient intolerance amongst her so-called Protestants, both within and without the pale of the Established Church. Mr. Wicksteed makes good use of the bigotry of the Romish Church, to shame

Protestant Churches out of their adoption of narrow principles and exclusive practices.

"This decree of the Pope has gone forth claiming obedience from all baptized persons under pain of eternal condemnation. The Church of England many times a year issues a declaration that all persons shall believe in the Athanasian Creed, under fear of the same penalty. The sentence of eternal condemnation is very easily pronounced by man, but thanks be to a merciful God, it is not so easily enforced by man. But who is concerned with this denunciation of the Athanasian Creed, except the bigot who believes it, the abject devotee who dreads it, and those members of the Church who, neither believing it, nor fearing it, still degrade themselves by reading it and hearing it. Does not our Church (and its law is supported by the State-law) refuse burial to an unbaptized person? Why should we fear the threats of the Church of Rome—issued in the technical terms used by it for centuries, and understood by its own members—any more than, or as much as, similar threats periodically and solemnly pronounced, supported, as far as they can be supported, by the civil power? I allow that this Papal Letter is couched in the usual terms of official presumption. I allow that to me the contemporaneous letter of the new Archbishop to his new charge, savours of vanity and exaggerated delight. But I have seen things that bore very much the same aspect to us as Dissenters, issuing from our own Episcopal Thrones, and Parish Church Pulpits. The language, and the assumptions, and the threats do not sound so new, and unheard of, and unequalled, to *our* ears, as they appear to do to our brethren of the Church of England. I hope it may help to reveal many of the Clergy and Laity of our Establishment to themselves, and teach them to exercise more toleration and respect for other people's convictions, since any interference with their own seems to give them so much pain. I trust they may now perceive what they have been inflicting on others, especially the last dozen years, by what they are suffering themselves. No—I trust that under the providence of God, this Papal aggression may do us all a great deal of good—teach us to respect each other's rights and liberties more—teach us not to denounce every man who conscientiously differs from us as a schismatic—teach us not to deny burial to a man because he is a Methodist—dispose us to expunge the creed of St. Athanasius from our Liturgy—incline us to look upon the exercise of independent thought upon the Scriptures with more sympathy and respect—lead us to open our Universities, that a stronger current of freer blood may flow through the veins of the nation, which shall be less alarmed at, and cause us to have less need to be alarmed at, the encroachments of Popery, which, under such circumstances, would become impossible."—Pp. 19—21.

It is a good sign that vigorous truth-telling like this has been sought with great avidity by the people of Leeds.

Mr. Berry, of Leicester, entitles his sermon "Remarks on Popery and the present Anti-Papal Agitation." It contains many weighty objections to Popery, yet gives credit to that system of religion for the good which its professors have really effected. Mr. Berry believes that the claim of infallibility will ultimately lead to the decline and overthrow of the Romish Church.

"I have often suggested this to Catholic priests. I remember once, when visiting the Monastery on our Forest Hills, a monk kindly shewed me the chapel, in which I had just listened to their service. He opened the chest in which were deposited the artificial flowers and other ornaments, which, I was told, were reserved for great occasions. We were standing before the altar. I said to him, 'Why do you not reform your Church? You have many advantages, but you must introduce some improvements.' He replied, 'We require no change. What alterations would you have?' 'Well,' said I, 'we will begin with this lamp over my head. What is the use of that?' 'Perhaps,' said he, 'you are not aware of the design of it?' I replied, 'I suppose one idea is to pay homage to Christ, a portion of whose real body you imagine to have in that box there: another is, to signify to the faithful, that Jesus Christ is the light of the world. But could not the pure solar ray, which now shines upon us, answer that purpose as well, or better, than this dingy oil-light which you have stuck up there? Depend upon it, such is the ignorance and superstition of the people; such the fondness of the rich and the poor, the aristocracy and the commonalty, for a pompous



ritual, demonstrated by the progress of Puseyite doctrines; and there is so much of Popish error and ceremony in our liturgy and rubric, that if you would but reform in some particulars, and adapt yourselves a little to the present times, I am not sure that you would not re-convert a large part of this nation. But if you will rigidly adhere to your old maxims and forms, which you must do, or renounce the claim to infallibility; in that case, it is impossible for you to recover your lost ground. You cannot stand against the increasing freedom, intelligence and spirit of the times."

"It has always been a satisfaction to me to hear the reply, that they cannot change: the Church was always right; there was nothing that required alteration: for I am confident that, in time, the presumption which lies at the foundation of their system must lead to their downfall."—Pp. 19, 20.

Mr. Bayley, of Stockport, has made good use of the recent excitement in "An Address to the Friends of the Established Church" in that town, reminding them of the indebtedness of their own Liturgy to the Romish Mass-book, and recommending them to reform it altogether.

---

*Biographical Dictionary.* By the Rev. John R. Beard, D.D. Vol. I.  
London—John Cassell.

THIS forms part of a popular Library now in the course of publication by Mr. Cassell. It is a marvellously cheap, and promises to be a very valuable work. The object of the Dictionary is to give a condensed account of the lives of great men of all ages and countries, "especially of such as have lived within the last century, and by their own efforts raised themselves and benefited their species." Many of our Biographical Dictionaries are tainted by political and religious bigotry. It is scarcely necessary to say that a work of Dr. Beard's will be free from this fault. The lives, though short, appear to be drawn up with care and judgment. The first volume carries us into the letter C. It will not be possible, on the same scale, to finish the work in four volumes, as originally proposed. We should regret to see any further compression. We shall probably return to this work on the publication of future volumes.

---

#### PERIODICALS.

*The Quarterly Review* (No. CLXXV., December 1850) opens with a pleasant article on the natural history of South Africa, founded on Mr. Rowaleyn Gordon Cumming's blood-stained records of his Hunter's Life in that country. We are glad to observe that the reviewer, as a man of science, hints his disapprobation of "the endless and too often useless slaughter of God's creatures." Our able and excellent contemporary the *Inquirer* was, we believe, the first to point out and protest against the cruelties perpetrated by this young Scottish sportsman, whom the reviewer speaks of as "the strong-blooded enthusiast of the chase." There is a fine tone in the closing words of the reviewer, where this fatal marksman is reminded, from the casual records which appear in his own journals, of the nobler use of knowledge and power made by the Anglo-Saxon Missionary.

"Here the homely Moravian or despised Methodist, bent to achieve the conquest over himself, a victory far above any that can be obtained over the brute beasts, tasks himself with all those duties that may tend in any measure to the dispersion of the dense mist of ignorance and superstition which has long clouded the minds of his dark brethren around him. He shews them better methods of cultivating the soil; he laboriously studies their dialect, and reduces it to writing; he teaches the young, sows the good seed of humane principles and charities in their fresh minds, and, working at his humble printing-press, diffuses the same principles wherever he has prepared the ground by the art of reading; he hastens to the relief of the wayward wanderer, who may have thwarted his best endeavours; in a word, his daily practice exemplifies the precepts which he specially inculcates on the Christian Sabbath, the Divine Author of which he feels himself

commissioned to make known to those who have never before had preached to them the gospel of peace; and all this Mr. Cumming relates without apparently one surmise of the inevitable conclusion."

The second article is on Socrates, founded of course on Mr. Grote's remarkable chapter, which the reviewer pronounces as the masterpiece of his History in originality of conception and excellence of execution. With every disposition on the part of the reviewer to concede to Mr. Grote's learning and talent the praise so fairly earned, we are glad to see that he demurs to the pleas by which, in an almost excess of candour, the historian palliates the condemnation of Socrates by the Athenians. The reviewer styles the life and character of Socrates "not merely moral, but religious, and not merely religious, but Christian;" and he defends his strong expression by adducing the authority of Justin Martyr. There is a beautiful comparison instituted between Socrates and Paul, and another between the Philosopher and the great Teacher of Nazareth. The reviewer, in a manner equally ingenious and sound, makes use of some peculiarities in the writings of the contemporaries and biographers of Socrates, in explanation of similar peculiarities in the four Gospels and in the works of Josephus.

"When we are perplexed by the difficulty of reconciling the narrative of the three first evangelists with the altered tone of the fourth, it is at least a step towards the solution of that difficulty to remember that there is here a parallel diversity of narrative, which, so far from destroying the historical truth of the whole representation, has rather confirmed it; the Socrates of Xenophon is widely different from the Socrates of Plato, and yet no one has been tempted by that diversity to doubt the substantial identity—the true character—much less the historical existence of the master whom they both profess to describe. Nor when we think of the total silence of Josephus, or of other contemporary writers, respecting the events which we now regard as the greatest in the history of mankind, is it altogether irrelevant to reflect that for the whole thirty years which Thucydides comprises in his work, Socrates was not only living, but acting a more public part than any other Athenian citizen; and yet that so able and so thoughtful an observer as Thucydides has never once noticed him, directly or indirectly. There is no stronger proof of the weakness of the argument from omission, especially in the case of ancient history, which, unlike our own, contained within its range of vision no more than was immediately before it for the moment."

Well and freely does the reviewer observe, that the example of Socrates "may be contemplated with advantage in an age like our own, where (*in which*) to found a party or to join a party in theology or in philosophy, is the virtue which covers a multitude of sins—where (*in which*) to do neither is to be exposed to attacks as mistaken and as eager in kind, though happily not in degree, as those which were levelled against the character and ultimately against the life of Socrates." What may we not look for next, when the *Quarterly Review* spares not the proud, truth-scorning and calumnious spirit of "orthodoxy"? But we cannot part from this fine essay, worthy of Mr. Milman himself, without repeating our high admiration of its wisdom and truth.

An article follows, in a very different spirit, on Mr. Cureton's translation of the Ignatian Epistles. The reviewer is evidently far more anxious to back up the orthodox "conclusions of Pearson and Bull," than to do justice to the learning and impartiality of Mr. Cureton.—There follows a party article on the government of Ceylon, written to damage Lord Torrington and Earl Grey. A short and feeble article follows on cheap sugar and the Slave-trade. The writer's aversion to cheap sugar and free trade is beyond doubt sincere—that to Brazilian slavery is probably a mere make-weight.—Art. 6 is a clever, dashing essay on the history, miscarriages and literary quarrels of the British Museum. For once the Edinburgh and Quarterly are heartily agreed in defending Mr. Panizzi against his host of accusers and censurers. The article contains so much valuable information, that it is to be regretted that it is

disfigured by persiflage and small personalities. The reviewer seems to have conceived that he had so tough and dry a joint to prepare for the public palate, that he must serve it up with all sorts of stimulants and sauce. Liberal politicians and writers are not the sole mark of the writer's satire. Here we have the secret history of George the Fourth's gift to the nation of the Royal Library:

"King George IV. having some pressing call for money, did not decline a proposition for selling the library in question to the Emperor of Russia. Mr. Heber, having ascertained that the books were actually booked for the Baltic, went to Lord Sidmouth, then Home Secretary, and stated the case, observing, 'what a shame it would be that such a collection should go out of the country;' to which Lord Sidmouth replied, 'Mr. Heber, it shall not;' and it did not. On the remonstrance of Lord Sidmouth, *of whose manly and straightforward character George IV. was very properly in awe* (?), the last of the Grand Monarques presented the books to the Museum, on the condition that the value of the rubles they were to have fetched should be somehow or other made good to him in pounds sterling. This was done out of the surplus of certain funds furnished by France for the compensation of losses by the Revolution. But his Ministers, on a hint from the House of Commons that it was necessary to refund these moneys, had recourse, we are told, to the droits of the Admiralty."

It is amusing enough to find that even Toryism now blushes to defend George IV. But how much longer will it think it expedient to defend such a public character as that of the late Lord Sidmouth? The word *straightforward* was slightly *mal à propos* in connection with this instance of *leger-demain* in handling public money. Another anecdote puts Manners Sutton in a respectable position at the expense of an Archbishop of Canterbury. The patronage of the Museum was in the hands of Lord Eldon, conjointly with the two Suttons,—the Archbishop and the Speaker.

"The mouth of the Speaker was dutifully dumb; and the father Archbishop became the real head of the triumvirate—the first consul. At that period the attendant situations were often given to the menial servants of influential people. \* \* \* The Primate brought an appointment, already signed by the Chancellor, and handed it over to the Speaker Abbot to add his name. 'Oh!' said he, returning it, read but unsigned, 'another servant of your Grace's! Two signatures are enough.' The Archbishop blushed and tore the paper."

An article on Southey is far less eulogistic than might have been anticipated in the Quarterly. The reviewer complains, justly enough, that the biographer does not give an intelligible history of the extent of Southey's early heresies, political and religious, or of his ultimate and settled creed. The criticism on Southey's works is keen, but cold. As a poet, but a humble position is assigned him—as a writer of prose, not the highest.—Art. 9, on the Ministers and the Pope, is much in the style of Mr. D'Israeli's letter, though less caustic. The reviewer, for the sake of wounding the abettors of Catholic Emancipation, and the statesmen who have since carried out the principles of that great measure, admits that the recent ferment of the public mind is "altogether unreasonable." As to the future, he says there only remains war with Rome, or a treaty of peace. War in the shape of hostilities against the feeblest temporal Prince in Europe, is, he admits, absurd; and war in the shape of the re-enactment of penal laws, a *dream*. No such measures would be endured by Parliament, nor even at this moment, excited as it is, by the British people. The alternative which the reviewer suggests is a *Concordat*, offensive though he knows that the mention of it will be at present. It is amusing enough to find the Quarterly reviewer on such a subject sheltering himself behind the authority of "the very statesmanlike reply of the Bishop of Norwich to his clergy."

---

The *Dublin Review* contains an article on the Hierarchy attributed by the newspapers (we cannot think correctly) to Cardinal Wiseman. It affects to



be written in a joyous and pleasant strain; but the joy is sometimes lachrymose, and the pleasantry not lively. There are some clever hits at some of the absurdities committed by the Anglican Bishops during the recent agitation, particularly at Bishop Wilberforce and his disastrous meeting of his clergy; but these topics have been handled with far more wit and effect by the *Examiner*. From the serious passages of the article we select one of the best.

"The Gorham controversy served to shew earnest minds how thoroughly the Anglican Church had been left void of faith; something else was needed to satisfy tender hearts that all bowels of charity and mercy had been taken from her. The close of the year has brought this awful proof. We say it deliberately,—during the terrible commotion which has agitated the nation, of the many bishops, dignitaries, rectors, and clergy of every rank, who have spoken on the question of our Hierarchy, we do not recollect one sentence uttered by any one of them which breathed a particle of the balmy air of charity. A kind, a gentle, even a forgiving word, has not escaped the lips of any Church authority; even where an attempt has been made to cool the ardour of the over fervent, or turn aside the current of assault, we have never seen it done in terms of kindness or even of forbearance towards us."

In reply to the charge against the Pope of insolence in ignoring the Anglican hierarchy and clergy, the reviewer argues that it was more civil to say nothing about them than to speak of them as impious heretics, &c. There is much feeble comment on a post-prandial remark of Mr. Justice Alderson, uttered at Cambridge, that the "Pope seemed to consider himself Gregory the Great, when in reality he was only Pius the Ninth." There are some not ill-directed gibes at the Church of England for its acceptance in its hour of danger of the help of Dissenters, whose ministers it previously ignored, but whom it has now almost for the first time received as *reverend* allies. Much good anger is wasted by the reviewer upon the public press of England. The newspapers, however they may have profited by the recent excitement, had rather less than usual to do in raising it. There has been a somewhat extravagant expression of surprise in some of the newspapers at the reviewer's suggestion, that Catholics should henceforth distinguish between their friends and their foes, and cast aside those papers which have pandered to the vile passions of religious agitators. We will extract one specimen of the reviewer's attempt at fun.

"A Tauromachia has always been a favourite pastime with John Bull, and he seems determined to get one up. Unfortunately, it has been discovered that the Bull on which the sport had to turn, has no more reality than the plaintiff in the celebrated case of 'Bullum v. Boatum.' The Pope unfortunately has sent no Bull at all over to England. An immense quantity of wit and declamation has been based on the supposed existence of this uncongenial document. Most of the street caricatures, and at least half of Punch's, are decidedly taurine; and the Catholic Hierarchy could hardly have been got up for them without a hat and a bull. But if the Pope has failed in providing this requisite for the sport, there are other means of supplying the deficiency. The celebrated letter of a statesman to a Bishop is one of the greatest bulls, the most practical bull, that has come before the public for a long time. Let that be baited, as no doubt it will."

---

The *Eclectic* begins a new series with an admirable No. Amongst the new religious periodicals, the *Christian Spectator* and the *Pathway* promise to be valuable acquisitions. We shall notice all of them in future Nos.

## INTELLIGENCE.

### DOMESTIC.

#### *Manchester New College.*

The annual meeting of the Trustees of the College was held at the Cross-Street chapel rooms on Thursday, Jan. 23, the chair being taken by J. Aspinall Turner, Esq. The Treasurer (William Rayner Wood, Esq.) presented the financial report, from which it appeared that the annual subscriptions collected during the past year amounted to £743. 16s.; the rents in Manchester produced £427; in Yorkshire, £204. 0s. 3d.; the interest on investments and floating balances, £176. 19s. 10d. The total receipts, including a legacy of £100 from the late Thomas Wilkins, Esq., and some miscellaneous items, amounted to £1683. 7s. 1d. The total disbursements of the year amounted to £1620. 11s. 8d., shewing a surplus of receipts over expenditure of £62. 15s. 6d. During the past year, the legacy of the late Jonas Davis, Esq., of Uckfield, was paid by his executors, amounting to £1124. 19s. This sum has been added to the permanent stock of the College. A very cordial vote of thanks to Mr. Wood attested the sense entertained by the Trustees of the value of his services as Treasurer. After the appointment of officers, the Address of the Committee was read by Rev. R. Brook Aspland, one of the Secretaries. The more important parts were as follows:

"It is now their pleasing task to reassure the friends and supporters of Manchester New College of its continued efficiency, of the watchful zeal of its Professors, and of the general diligence and proficiency of its students.

"It is matter of high satisfaction to the Committee that, notwithstanding the various difficulties which have during past years beset the institution, they have been enabled to uphold its pecuniary credit and its literary and scientific reputation, and that they may still claim for it the respect of the lovers of learning, and the support of those who desire for their sons and their future ministers a Collegiate establishment in which the rights of private judgment are respected, and free inquiry is practised and encouraged.

"It is indeed true that Manchester New College has ceased to be the only institution in England enjoying this

honourable distinction. Its friends may well rejoice that the great principle which this institution has upheld for nearly sixty-five years, and which for a long time it alone upheld, is now recognized by others, and that new academical institutions have arisen which offer liberal education to the sons of the middle classes of England, without the fetter of a doctrinal test, and the snare of subscription to articles of religion.

"The past services of the College to the cause of learning, truth and religious liberty, entitle it to continued support; and the Committee with confidence renew their appeal on its behalf to the congregations of the English Presbyterians, so many of whose ministers and lay members have within its walls laid the foundation of their public usefulness and well-deserved reputation.

"The small number of students who now seek to enjoy the advantages of the College, is sometimes made a ground of objection. To some extent the Committee admit and feel the evil. They have long been anxious to increase both the resources of the institution and the number of the students. With respect to the latter, their efforts have been during the present session attended with some success. But they do not wish to deceive themselves or others by encouraging the expectation that a large accession of students is immediately probable. The friends of free inquiry and unsectarian learning have ever been in England, and must yet continue to be, a small minority. Patient perseverance through opposition and difficulty, and laborious and costly preparation for advantages which, however distant, are supremely important, have been the distinguishing qualities of the Protestant Nonconformists of this country. From their ranks, Manchester New College has drawn unfailing supporters; and there is no reason for entertaining the fear that an impatient craving for popular success, and a desire for mere novelty, will deprive the institution of the support of its old and highly valued friends. On the contrary, the Committee have observed during the past year many indications of returning and increased cordiality of feeling towards the College. They would specify, with satisfaction, the

unprecedentedly numerous attendance of the friends at the last Examination, and the patience and interest with which its protracted, but highly gratifying, proceedings were regarded.

"During the past year, two ministers formerly educated in the College, and one of them subsequently benefiting it by his judgment and learning as Principal and Theological Professor, have been removed by death. With deep respect for their memory, the Committee mention the names of the late Rev. William Wilson, of Newbury, and with especial sorrow the late Rev. Robert Wallace, of Bath. The Committee are reminded by melancholy notices of this description of the thinning of the list of supporters which is constantly going on, and would impress upon themselves and others the necessity of zealous watchfulness in filling up, by constant activity, vacancies in the list of supporters and friends.

"To the notices which have appeared in former Addresses respecting the Owens Institution, and its possible influence on the future plans of Manchester New College, the Committee have only to add that the Principal and several Professors have been recently appointed, and that they will probably in a short time open their classes and make known their plans. At the general meeting of Trustees of Manchester New College, held at the close of the Examination, a special Committee was appointed to 'consider and obtain information on the question of a connection with the Owens College, and of the extent and degree of such connection;' the powers of the Committee being limited to the obtaining of information on the above subject, and the expression of their own views thereupon. Their Report will be hereafter presented to Trustees specially summoned to receive and consider it, but at present no materials exist whereon to found a Report. Anticipating hereafter from this source much valuable information for the guidance of the Trustees of the College, the Committee feel it to be their duty to abstain at the present from all expression of opinion on this important subject, beyond giving utterance to the hope that, whatever changes may hereafter be found necessary, due care will be taken to secure to the students of the College literary and scientific advantages at least equal to those which they have hitherto enjoyed.

"It is now the painful duty of the Committee to report that they have received from the Rev. John Kenrick, M. A., the announcement of his wish to retire from the offices held by him, conveyed in words which they are sure will be read with deep interest by all friends of the College.

"To the Committee of Manchester New College.

"Gentlemen,—I beg to announce to you that it is my intention to resign, at Midsummer next, the offices of Principal and Professor of History which I hold in your institution.

"I find that the necessity which the tenure of these offices imposes upon me, of residing for several weeks at a time in Manchester, involves an interruption of my own pursuits and occupations, the inconvenience of which I feel more sensibly when I contemplate the short portion of life which in all probability remains to me.

"I am satisfied, also, that whether your institution remains upon its present footing or is connected with Owens College, it possesses the means of carrying on the work of my department with equal or greater advantage to the students.

"In thus announcing the termination of a connection which has continued through forty years, I beg the Committee to accept my best thanks for the kindness which I have uniformly experienced from them. To have laboured so long in conjunction with them, for the promotion of a noble object, I shall always regard as the most honourable and happy circumstance of my life.

"I remain, Gentlemen, with respect and gratitude, yours faithfully,

JOHN KENRICK.

"York, Dec. 9, 1850."

"Immediately after the receipt of this communication, the Committee passed a resolution which, after expressing their deep pain, conveyed their anxious desire to make whatever arrangement may best secure to the College in future the advantage of such superintendence from Mr. Kenrick as he may feel himself able to give; and that it be referred to Mr. Kenrick to state whether in his opinion this object will be best attained by the Committee requesting him to accept the vacant office of Visitor, and to visit the College at the commencement and in the middle of the session, as well as



at the annual Examination, as often as it may be agreeable to him to do so.

"The Committee are now happy to be able to announce that, in resigning the office of Principal, Mr. Kenrick has readily accepted the vacant office of Visitor; and that, though no longer residing for some weeks of the year in Manchester, he will visit the College at the commencement and in the middle of the College session, as well as at the annual Examination.

"The vacant office of Principal has been filled by the appointment of the Rev. George Vance Smith, B.A., successor of the late Rev. Robert Wallace in the chair of Critical and Exegetical Theology.

"The Committee have high satisfaction in adding the testimony of Mr. Kenrick to their own conviction, that in that department of instruction to which Mr. Kenrick's services have been so long and so admirably given, the College already possesses in Mr. Bowman and Mr. Gaskell the services of gentlemen eminently fitted to supply, so far as it can be supplied, the loss of services which have been rendered so long and so faithfully, and the eminent value of which they once more with deep and unaffected feeling gratefully and respectfully acknowledge."

#### *Birmingham Unitarian Brotherly Society'*

The annual meeting of this Society was held on Sunday evening, Jan. 5, in the upper school-room, New-Meeting Street, when the following reports were read and adopted:—The numbers of pupils in the various Unitarian schools in the town are—girls, 693; boys, 1439; total, 2132; and teachers—females, 73; males, 205: total, 278. There has been an increase in five years of 5 teachers and 439 pupils. 1229 books have been added during the same period to the libraries, making the present number 6909; exchanged for reading during the year, 22,097, an increase in five years of 3730. The Savings' Club has 927 depositors, depositing during the year £711.15s. 6½d., and there has been withdrawn £480. 13s. 5d. The largest amount received

in one deposit is £2, the smallest, ½d.; increase in five years of £196. 9s. 11½d. in deposits, and of 140 depositors. Loan Fund: received by subscriptions and repayments, £25. 14s. 6d.; advanced to members, £30; in Savings' Bank and Treasurer's hands, £65. 1s. 5d.; out in loans, £123. 7s. 6d.; giving a total of £188. 8s. 11d. The Benefit Sick Society has 385 subscribers, and the amount of subscriptions received during the year is £186. 4s. 8d.; paid for sickness and three funerals, £121. 19s. 10d.; surgeon's salary and sundry expenses, £33. 19s. 2d.: a saving on the subscriptions alone of £30. 5s. 8d.; added to which, £220. 16s. received for interest, makes the total capital of this Society £4071. 8s. 8d.—an increase in the year of £223. 9s. 8d.

*Subjects of a Course of Lectures, to be delivered on successive Thursday Evenings, in Cross-Street Chapel, Manchester.*

1851. Jan. 30: The proper Spirit and Objects of Religious Controversy. Rev. J. G. Robberds.

Feb. 6: Religion—its Root in Human Nature and its Manifestation in Scripture. Rev. J. J. Tayler.

Feb. 13: The primitive Form and the permanent Essence of Christianity. Rev. J. R. Beard.

Feb. 20: Sin—its Nature, Prevalence, Source and Remedy. Rev. W. Gaskell.

Feb. 27: The Word made Flesh. Rev. G. V. Smith.

March 6: Sympathy with Christ, the Christianity most needed for the Spiritual Life of Churches and the Conversion of the World. Rev. J. G. Robberds.

March 13: The Scriptural Value of the Death of Christ, and its Spiritual Significance. Rev. J. J. Tayler.

Feb. 20: Faith—its Source, Operation and Final Effects. Rev. John R. Beard.

Feb. 27: Some of the Changes which Orthodox Creeds have undergone and are still undergoing. Rev. W. Gaskell.

Service will commence at 7 o'clock each evening.

Seats will be provided for any strangers who may wish to attend.

## OBITUARY.

1850. Sept. 11, at Croft, near Warrington, Mrs. ELLEN YATES, wife of Mr. Samuel Yates, farmer, of that place. The death of Mrs. Yates demands more than a passing notice in our obituary. She was born in Warrington, on the 5th April, 1778. Her maiden name was Urmston, and her parents were working people in that town. At the early age of nine years she went to service in the house of the late Rev. — Aspinall, minister of the then Risley congregation. On the death of Mrs. Aspinall, which took place a few years after, such was the care, foresight, prudence and industry, manifested by the young servant, that Mr. Aspinall continued her in his service as housekeeper until her marriage with Mr. Yates, which took place at Flixton, on the 13th February, 1803. She was the mother of ten children, six of whom survive her. In 1838, the Independents, amongst other of their nefarious attempts to wrest our chapels from the descendants of those who built them, succeeded in the case of Risley chapel, though they failed in their efforts to connect it with their own body, as the Scotch Presbyterians eventually got a minister of their own appointed to it. On this event, Mr. and Mrs. Yates, with that zeal which so eminently characterized their lives, opened their house for divine worship on Sundays; and for nearly a year service was carried on by supplies, chiefly from Warrington, but occasionally from other neighbouring places. Mrs. Yates, moved with a holy zeal on behalf of the Unitarian cause, determined in her own mind that a chapel should be built for the dispossessed congregation of which she was a member; and, disclosing her intentions to some of her more immediate friends, received such encouragement as to induce her to proceed in the work with vigour. With no other influence than the native eloquence of a devoted heart, and strengthened by her faith in God's providence, she successively visited Warrington, Manchester, Dukinfield, Bolton, Bury, Walmsley, Liverpool, Hindley, Rivington and Chowbent—her husband assisting her in Manchester, Gorton and Hyde—and succeeded in raising upwards of £500 for the purpose. To save expense, she frequently walked great distances in these journeys, not unfrequently return-

ing home through the dark and dirty lanes of the country, tired and wet, at nine, ten, eleven, and even twelve o'clock at night. Her zeal, combined with great simplicity and moderation, roused a public feeling in her favour. The late Holbrook Gaskell, Esq., of Warrington, when he saw her determined earnestness in the work, consented to become the Treasurer of the fund. The late Mr. Blackburne, of Rhyll, who had an estate in Croft, a township adjoining Risley, and conveniently situated for the purpose, gave the land, which also supplied clay for the bricks. Workmen were employed, many of the congregation helping as opportunity served, and in less than a year a very neat and suitable building, with school-rooms attached, was erected; and the opening services, on September 27 and 29, 1839, were conducted by the Rev. J. Martineau and the Rev. J. H. Thom, of Liverpool; and very handsome collections made, which, with the balance of subscriptions collected by Mr. and Mrs. Yates, produced an endowment of £200, to aid in carrying on the permanent services of the chapel. The delight she experienced in joining with her fellow-christians in the worship of God, made her a constant attendant at the chapel as long as health and strength remained to her. On one occasion, after spending a Saturday in Manchester, collecting money for the building of the chapel, she arrived at the railway station just after the last train had started; but rather than not be in her accustomed place in the Sunday meetings that were then held in her own house, she resolutely determined to walk the whole distance, about 18 miles, and reached home about two o'clock in the morning. She took great interest in the Sunday-schools, and taught there till her growing infirmities kept her at home. First her eye-sight declined, till she became quite blind; and then she was afflicted with a painful cancer in her back, which at length brought her useful and valuable life to a close. Patience and resignation to the Divine Will ever accompanied her sufferings. Her interest in the welfare of her fellow-creatures remained with all the force her declining faculties would allow, until at length she fell asleep in Jesus, on Sept. 11,

1850, aged 72 years. The Croft congregation, desirous of commemorating her zeal and usefulness, commenced a subscription for a plain marble tablet, and, with the assistance of a numerous body of friends in Warrington, Liverpool, Manchester, Bury, Dukinfield, Knutsford and other places, have nearly succeeded in their object. It will be a plain marble slab, fixed in the wall above the pew she usually occupied in the chapel, and will bear the following inscription:

In Memory of  
ELLEN, the wife of Samuel YATES, of  
Croft.

She was born in Warrington, the 5th  
day of April, 1778;  
was married at Flixton, the 13th Feb.,  
1803;

and after a long and painful illness,  
borne with much patience,  
she died the 11th September, 1850,  
aged 72 years.

To her great and unwearied exertions,  
aided by those of her husband,  
under the blessing of Divine Providence,  
the Croft congregation of Unitarian  
Christians  
are chiefly indebted for this their House  
of Prayer  
and the Endowment connected with it.

Her memory as a wife and mother  
is treasured in the hearts of her sor-  
rowing husband and children;  
her ready kindness endeared her to her  
neighbours;  
while her consistent example through  
a long life

of zeal without bigotry, of earnestness  
without presumption,  
of undoubting faith and cheerful trust  
in God,

was such as to adorn and evidence  
the deep sincerity of her Christian pro-  
fession.

To commemorate her zealous labours,  
and their own sense of her great  
Christian worth, her fellow-wor-  
shippers, joined by a numerous body  
of distant friends, caused this Tablet  
to be erected.

Being dead, she yet speaketh.

Nov. 4, DRUMMOND, son of Rev. J.  
Scott PORTER, aged 6 years.

Nov. 13, at Garnaut, Carmarthen-  
shire, the residence of his son, RICHARD  
PERKINS, Esq., formerly of Penmain,  
near Newport, Monmouthshire, in the  
78th year of his age.

Nov. 14, at Greenheys Road, Texteth  
Park, Liverpool, THOMAS FLETCHER,  
Esq., aged 83 years.

Dec. 1, at Higham Hill, Waltham-  
stow, in her 82nd year, after a few days'  
illness, MARY, the beloved wife of the  
Rev. E. COGAN. She was much es-  
teemed by all who knew her, and her  
removal is deeply regretted by her fam-  
ily and friends. Her life was spent  
in doing good, and her end was peace.

Nov. 29, in the 7th year of her age,  
CATHARINE LEIGH, the only and be-  
loved child of John BOOTH, Esq., of  
Greenbank, Monton, near Eccles, Lan-  
cashire. Large intelligence and affec-  
tions had made her the object of many  
hopes.

Dec. 6, in the 75th year of her age,  
CATALINA, relict of the Rev. John  
WADSWORTH, formerly of Parbold Hall,  
in the county of Lancaster.

Dec. 12, at 42, Whitechapel Road,  
in her 68th year, ELIZA, relict of Mr.  
W. GREEN, and eldest daughter of the  
late Rev. Habakkuk Crabb, of Royston.

1851. Jan. 1, at her residence, West-  
mead House, Allington, near Bridport,  
MISS COLFOX, in the 68th year of her  
age. We cannot record this death  
without a few observations on the  
character of the deceased. Miss Col-  
fox was born in Bridport, and the place  
of her birth was the sphere of her use-  
fulness throughout her life. Among  
her fellow-townpeople, of all religious  
opinions, she obtained a high degree  
of respect from her peculiarly excellent  
and Christian qualities. In her family  
relations she was eminently kind. How  
affectionately and constantly, with what  
spontaneous tenderness and watchful-  
ness, she discharged them all, none can  
tell but those who were bound to her  
by the closest ties; but her most con-  
spicuous trait—that which struck all  
who knew her—was her devotion to  
duty. Upon the ground of her convic-  
tions and principles she stood as one  
who was immoveable, and the course  
which they prescribed she pursued  
with a steady and determined step.  
And not only so, but she reduced to a  
beautiful harmony with this fidelity to  
duty, a humility which won the admi-  
ration of her friends. It was not a  
feeling of self-distrust, for she reve-  
renced and relied upon the powers  
wherewith God had blessed her. It



was rather an absence of all pretension and self-exaltation. It was a meekness that was gentle up to the very point of principle and duty, but which there turned to adamant. The other characteristic of the subject of this notice which won the esteem of her neighbours, was her disinterestedness. The principle of Christian love entered largely into her spiritual existence. How it was poured forth on those whom the close unions of life brought into her circle, a large number of mourners testify. She felt and manifested an affectionate interest in all, loving her friends most lovingly, but feeling that the heart is for the many as well as for the few—for the sinful and erring as well as for the good. How earnestly she desired to lead the erring as well as the Christian to those fountains of living water where she had relieved the wants of her own soul, the labours of her past life, and her support of every benevolent institution having such an object in view, declare. Her mortal remains rest in the yard attached to the chapel which has been so often consecrated by her prayer and praise; but she still speaks to us, calling upon those who are left to mourn her loss to be faithful unto death, and "followers of them who through faith and patience inherit the promises." J. L. S.

Jan. 4, at her son's house, Framlingham, near Norwich, MARY, relict of the late Isaac JECKS, Esq., in her 92nd year. She was a woman of rare benevolence, combined with most perfect unselfishness; the practice of these virtues, through a lengthened term of existence, endear her memory to many who now mourn her removal from amongst them.

The following obituary of Colonel WILLIAMS, from the pen of Mr. Rush-ton, appeared originally in the columns of the *Liverpool Mercury*, Dec. 20.

It is with the deepest regret that we record the death of a gallant soldier and a true patriot. Colonel George Williams, late M.P. for Ashton, died yesterday morning, at half-past six o'clock, at the age of 87, at his residence, in Woolton. To those who know the history of Liverpool for the last half century, and particularly to those who have been habitual readers of this journal, it is unnecessary to recal in detail the history of the gallant

Colonel. Since the year 1811, the columns of the *Liverpool Mercury* have given the history of many a struggle made for popular rights in bad times, and many an effort made for the people, when, to make it, was a service which brought to such men as Colonel Williams unmerited opprobrium. From his earliest youth to his latest manhood the career of Colonel Williams has been one which has excited the sympathy and commanded the praise of the most enlightened portion of his fellow-citizens. In every relation of life he was a rare example of exact fidelity, of the highest courage, and of integrity which was never questioned. In all essentials in public life he was eminently an Englishman; he was of approved courage, of great knowledge, of unswerving honesty; and on every occasion his conduct gave the assurance that he had no object but to discover what was right and to do it.

Colonel Williams, though of English, or rather Welsh extraction, was born at St. John's, Newfoundland, of which island his father was lord chief justice, and whither he had gone in early manhood in company with his elder brother, Griffith Williams, a major in the Artillery, and an officer of considerable distinction in his profession. In the corps to which his uncle, Griffith Williams, belonged, Colonel Williams, at the age of twelve years, joined Gen. Burgoyne's army in America, we believe as a kind of volunteer, according to the custom of those days, and went through all the hardships and disasters which attended that expedition. After the battle at Stillwater, (the last general engagement before the surrender of the British troops,) at which his uncle and Major Ackland were wounded and taken prisoners, he was one of those selected by General Burgoyne to escort Lady Harriet Ackland in her perilous voyage in an open boat down the Hudson river, when she went, in a wild and stormy night, to entreat permission to enter the American camp, that she might share the captivity of her husband. Either owing to the courtesy of General Gates, or on account of his extreme youth, Colonel Williams was not detained as a prisoner; for, six days later, when Gen. Burgoyne surrendered at Saratoga, he carried the flag of truce sent into the enemy's camp. There being an exchange of prisoners, Major Williams returned to England with the regiment to which he belonged, bringing with

him his nephew, whom he immediately entered as a pupil at the academy of Woolwich, at which place he himself held an honourable appointment, and where he died some years afterwards, with the rank of Colonel.

On the completion of his studies at Woolwich, Colonel Williams entered the 20th regiment of foot, in which he served for about twenty-five years. During the whole of that period he was in constant active service, and not more than once or twice, we believe, even asked for leave of absence. He served in Nova Scotia, St. Domingo, and Jamaica, and during the Maroon war, a period of great danger. We have heard that he defended a small fort against the Maroons for a considerable length of time, and with a degree of gallantry and success that called forth general admiration amongst all to whom the circumstances were known. When the 20th regiment went out to the West Indies, it was one of the finest in the service; but so terrible were the effects of war and climate, that Colonel Williams was one of *only four* officers that returned with it to England. We have heard that when they landed at Plymouth, after an absence of only three years, the whole regiment consisted of thirty-three individuals; and so miserable was their appearance, from suffering and hard service, that, in marching to Exeter, they were taken for a mere recruiting party. Colonel Williams was on service in Ireland at the time of the French invasion in 1798, and being on the staff of General Champagne, his situation was a responsible one. The Colonel also served in Holland. In the year 1800 he sold out of the army, with the rank of major. His subsequent command of the Liverpool Volunteers, with the rank of lieutenant-colonel, is well known; and when that corps was disbanded, he was presented by the regiment with a valuable piece of plate, as a token of the esteem in which he was held.

On retiring from the army, Colonel Williams married Mrs. James, the widowed daughter of the late Nicholas Ashton, Esq., of Woolton, and the mother of William James, Esq., of Barrock lodge, late member for Carlisle. Changing his sword for a ploughshare, Colonel Williams purchased and cultivated a small estate at Little Woolton. When, however, the threat of invasion raised the country, Colonel Williams organised a regiment of volunteers. His regiment, composed of the mer-

chants and tradesmen of Liverpool, was one of the finest volunteer corps ever seen. The members of it were almost all of the middle class, who, on the first alarm, flew to arms in defence of the integrity of the English soil. All who remember that regiment (and we have spoken on the subject lately with some veterans) will readily acknowledge that, under the vigilant care and discipline of Colonel Williams, there were in its ranks as fine materials for war as ever the call of patriotism drew from the ranks of civil life. On the 23rd of February, 1809, Colonel Williams was made a free burgess of the borough of Liverpool.

Living in the immediate neighbourhood of Allerton and Gateacre, it may be easily imagined that Colonel Williams found congenial companions in Mr. Roscoe and Dr. Shepherd. For many years, indeed, until the deaths of these excellent men, he lived on terms of the closest intimacy with them. The scholar and the patriot soon formed a true estimate of the somewhat stern soldier; and he, not less apt, discerned in the literary men those who were able to acquire the triumphs which peace has no less than war. Those who remember the days of which we speak, will think, with gratitude and respect, upon the boldness, the honesty, and the activity of the gallant colonel. They will remember the rage and the bitterness engendered in the fierce party strife of those days. And they only will be able to appreciate the courage of a soldier of character and high honour, who dared to take an unequivocal part with the people. The Colonel was, by his position, supposed to be essentially an aristocrat. He was, in truth, simply what every gentleman is, a lover of justice and fair-play. Having become a citizen and a justice of the peace, (for he was at his death the senior magistrate, with one exception, for this county,) he saw that the people did not get either justice or fair-play, and he resolved, so far as his exertions could be available, that they should have both justice and fair-play. If the Colonel incurred the hatred of one section, he gained the applause of another. If the Tories assailed him, and stabbed his horse under him during Mr. Roscoe's election, the great body of the people felt they had a friend, and they gave the Colonel all the moral influence which could be derived from their support. An anecdote has reached us, touching the Colo-



nel about this time, alike honourable to him and to Lord Sidmouth. When Lord Sidmouth was in Lancashire, on one occasion, some of those whose reverence for mere authority was greater than their regard for justice, applied to Lord Sidmouth to have Col. Williams removed from the commission of the peace. His Lordship said he would inquire about the matter. He did so; and, at a subsequent meeting of the parties who applied to him, his Lordship said—"I find that Colonel Williams is really the poor man's magistrate; that he hears and settles causes at five o'clock in the morning, before the labourer goes to his work, and so saves his day. Do you, gentlemen, know who will take this line of business, if the Colonel be removed?" Lord Sidmouth thus met the complaints against a political opponent. When the Reform Act became a law, the electors of Ashton-under-Lyne, knowing Colonel Williams by his public acts as a magistrate and as a politician, sent a deputation to Little Woolton, to invite him to become a candidate for the representation of their borough. The deputation found the Colonel with a spade in his hand and good strong clogs on his feet, working on his farm. He declined to give any other reply to their request, than that, if he were

elected, he would serve them. He refused to canvas the constituency, or to take any part whatever in the matter. To the honour of Ashton, the electors returned the Colonel, and he sat as their representative in the first Reformed Parliament.

In the estimation of many of our readers the character of Colonel Williams will be considerably raised, and in the estimation of none will it be depreciated, by the fact that, for the greater portion of his long life, he not only totally abstained from intoxicating liquors, but discountenanced their use by others.

We feel how inadequate this brief and necessarily hasty notice is to do justice to Colonel Williams. He spent his youth and his early manhood in arms, in the service of his country; his riper years were devoted, as a citizen, to the spread of true knowledge, to the administration of justice, and to the promotion of the cause of civil and religious liberty; and of him it may be truly said that, from his boyhood upwards, he had no aim, no object, but to uphold the honour of his country and to promote the happiness of his countrymen. [We may add that Col. Williams was a member of the Presbyterian congregation at Gateacre.]

## MARRIAGES.

1850. Nov. 7, at the Ancient chapel of Toxteth Park, Liverpool, by the Rev. Jas. Martineau, FREDERICK JOHN HADDEN, Esq., of Nottingham (late of Kandy, Ceylon), to MARGARET JANE, eldest daughter of Thomas HARVEY, Esq., solicitor, of Liverpool.

Dec. 24, at the Bank-Street chapel, Bolton, by the Rev. Franklin Baker, JAMES HIGGIN, Esq., of Manchester, to SARAH TIPPING, third daughter of the late Joshua CROOK, Esq., of Whitebank, Bolton.

Recently, at the chapel in the Coni-

gree, Trowbridge, by Rev. S. Martin, Mr. GEORGE WHATLEY to Miss HARRIET JONES, both of Melksham—Mr. THOMAS RUDDLE, of Trowbridge, to Miss SARAH HILL, of Melksham—Mr. ALFRED JAS. MORRIS to Mrs. ELIZA BASCOMB, both of Trowbridge—Mr. JACOB HAWKINS, of Trowbridge, to Miss MARY ANN WITCOMBE, of Road Hill, Somerset—Mr. HENRY NUTT to Miss ELIZABETH GOWAN, both of Trowbridge—Mr. WM. PACKER to Miss JANE ALESBURY, both of Trowbridge—Mr. GEORGE CHIVERS to Mrs. HARRIET SMITH, both of Melksham—Mr. JACOB MOORE to Mrs. ELIZABETH TAYLOR, both of Trowbridge.